

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME X
NUMBER 7

SEPTEMBER, 1902

WHOLE
NUMBER 97

THE NEW ENGLAND GRAMMAR SCHOOL, 1635-1700.

IN studying the Latin grammar school of New England previous to 1700, only a portion of the present territory really comes under consideration. Early action relative to schools depended much on the character of the settlers, the purpose of their coming, their previous education, the controlling spirit of the leaders, and somewhat on their wealth and surroundings. The initial spirit of it all was in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and, when some of the people from around Boston migrated to Hartford and Windsor and Wethersfield and founded the Connecticut Colony, the spirit went with them. The same spirit is found in the New Haven Colony; it spread to the Plymouth Colony, and later its reflection fell upon New Hampshire, which was under Massachusetts law until 1680. The founders of Rhode Island wanted nothing in common with the people who banished them, not even their education; and the status of the Maine settlers is found in this remark of Winthrop's: "They ran a different course from us both in their ministry and in their civil administration." Vermont was not settled.

The study really narrows to the consideration of four confederations, the two in Massachusetts, which united in 1692, and the two in Connecticut, which united in 1665. The essence of the Massachusetts law of 1647 was embodied in the Connecticut code of 1650, the New Haven code of 1656, the Plymouth

law of 1670, and was taken practically entire by New Hampshire in 1680; these vary somewhat in details, but they are unimportant. Upon the union of these four confederations into two colonies, the 1647 law prevailed for the larger Massachusetts, and the 1650 code for the larger Connecticut.

In the beginning, the most strenuous efforts were exerted at Boston and New Haven under the leadership of four men, Cotton and Eliot at the first, Davenport and Eaton at the second. Without the Rev. John Cotton, New England may not have had the grammar school, certainly not at so early a period. Arriving in 1633, in two years he influenced Boston to cast that memorable vote of entreaty to Brother Philemon Pormont to undertake the "teaching and nourishing of children among us." The next year the school certainly began under Mr. Daniel Maude, Harvard College was projected, founded two years later with Mr. Cotton upon the working committee, and from that time until his death, in 1652, his voice and influence were directed toward education.

The Rev. John Eliot, of Roxbury, was an able exponent of the same views. Mather, in his *Magnalia*, says of him :

A grammar school he would always have upon the place, whatever it cost him: and he importuned all other places to have the like. I cannot forget the ardor with which I even heard him pray, in a synod of these churches which met at Boston, to consider "how the miscarriages which were among us might be prevented." I say with what fervor he uttered an expression to this purpose: "Lord, for schools everywhere among us. O that our schools may flourish. That every member of this assembly may go home and procure a good school to be encouraged in the town where he lives. That before we die we may see a good school encouraged in every plantation of the country." God so blessed his endeavors, that Roxbury could not live quietly without a free school in the town; and the issue of it has been one thing which has made me almost put the title of Schola Illustris upon that little nursery: that is, "That Roxbury has afforded more scholars, first for the college and then for the public, than any town of its bigness, or if I mistake not, of twice its bigness, in all New England."

The enthusiasm of these men and the influence of the college was felt in the settlements clustered near the coast of Massachusetts Bay, and the several schools were founded in this order.

1635.—The Boston Latin School, whose history has been too

frequently written to need repetition here, was begun in 1635 or 1636.

1636.—The school at Charlestown was begun in 1636. Though it is not mentioned as a grammar school, there is every reason to believe it was one at the outset. It certainly was a grammar school when Ezekiel Cheever became master in 1661, and in 1671 the second article of agreement with Benjamin Thompson read "that he shall prepare such youth as are capable of it for the college, with learning answerable."

1637.—When Salem voted Rev. John Fiske in as an inhabitant in 1637, there was little thought in the minds of the voters that from that act Salem would have one of the oldest schools in New England. Such is the recorded fact, however, and today she points with pride to the tablet on her old Latin school building: "Founded in the Year 1637." Few early votes relative to the school are recorded, but they are sufficient to show its continuous existence. In 1670, "the selectmen shall take care to provide a grammar schoolmaster," and one was engaged for £20. In 1677 the subjects of instruction are given as English, Latin, and Greek, good manners, and the principles of Christian religion. These were taught scholars "so as to fit them for the university, if desired and they are capable." In 1712 a committee was chosen to select a teacher for the Latin school. From this point allusions to the school are frequent.

1639.—This year witnessed Dorchester's famous agreement whereby a yearly rental of £20 was placed on Thompson's Island, "to be paid to such a schoolmaster as shall undertake to teach English, Latin, and other tongues, and also write." Later in the year the Rev. Thomas Waterhouse was elected schoolmaster.

1640-43.—In *New England's First Fruits* appears this sentence:

And by the side of the college, a fair grammar school for the training up of young scholars and fitting them for academical learning, that still as they are judged ripe, they may be received into the college.

The exact date of the beginning of the Cambridge school is not known, but in 1643 Mr. Elijah Corlett had been there long

enough to establish a reputation "for skill and faithfulness." The first mention of the school in the town records is this:

September 13, 1648, it was agreed at a meeting of the whole town, that there should be land sold of the common for the gratifying of Mr. Corlett for his pains in keeping a school in the town, the sum of £10, if it can be attained, provided it shall not prejudice the cow common.

This £10, which was obtained the following spring, was recorded as "a gratuity from the town."

1645.—In this year the inhabitants of Roxbury founded their grammar school "in consideration of their religious care of posterity" and because they recognized "how necessary the education of their children in literature will be, to fit them for public service, both in church and commonwealth, in succeeding ages." This was and is an endowed school. In 1666 the town was invited to join the proprietors in its support and extension, but refused.

1645, 1646.—There are strong indications that Braintree founded a school about the same time as Roxbury, though there is no direct evidence of this fact in the records until 1735. In that year a petition was sent to the general court asking for certain grants. Among them is this: "And likewise grant us something gratis for our having kept a free Latin school for about ninety years."

These seven schools were the feeders in Massachusetts to Harvard College. They were qualified to meet the demands, which were not excessive.

When any scholar is able to read Tully or such classical author, extempore, and speak true Latin in verse and prose, and decline perfectly the paradigms of nouns and verbs in the Greek tongue, then they may be admitted into college, nor shall any claim admission before such qualifications.

Other aid than persuasion was needed, and the law of 1647 was enacted, making it obligatory upon towns of one hundred families to maintain a grammar school, "the masters thereof being able to instruct youth so far as they may be fitted for the university." To stimulate scholastic ambitions, a penalty of £5 was affixed for all towns not having such a school.

There is no way of ascertaining how many towns were

affected by this law; certainly there was no rapid increase in grammar schools, and the records of many towns show no desire to establish such schools until they had reached the full legal standard of one hundred families; ninety-nine were not enough.

The extreme brevity of the ancient record makes it very difficult to differentiate the kind of school established in many cases. However, as far as may be judged, the order of schools following the law seems to be as follows:

1650.—Watertown elected Richard Norcross, in 1650, schoolmaster, "for the teaching of children to read and write, and so much of Latin according to the order of the Court;" and the next year he was re-engaged to instruct "in English, writing or Latin according to the capacity of the persons." The fee for Latin was fixed at four pence a week. Mr. Norcross remained in the service for twenty-five years, when there was a desire to obtain a schoolmaster "as cheap as they can." But in 1679 Mr. Norcross was again sought, and to save expense the selectmen made an agreement with him—

To keep the school at the school house for the year following, and to begin the 9th of April, 1679, and to teach both Latin and English scholars, so many as shall be sent unto him from the inhabitants, and once a week to teach them their catechism; only in the months of May, June, July, and August, he is to teach only Latin scholars and writers, and them at his own house, and there to afford them all needful help, and the other eight months at the school house, both Latin and English scholars, for which the Selectmen agree that he shall have £20.

The people complained of the agreement, so the school was kept at the schoolhouse the whole year, and Mr. Norcross received £25. The next year the school was made an English school, but the court ordered the town to provide a grammar school, and Richard Norcross was again engaged with a salary of £25, and the benefit of the Latin scholars.

1651.—Ipswich made an attempt to establish one of the very early grammar schools; the result is found in this record of 1636: "A grammar school is set up but does not succeed." In 1651 the town made a grant of land for a second grammar school. Mr. Robert Payne built the house, and gave his house and two acres of land for the use of the schoolmaster; other

endowments followed. This was the school of which Ezekiel Cheever was master for ten years, and made "famous throughout the land."

1653.—It is exceedingly difficult to determine with surety what kind of a school was established in Dedham. It began in 1644, but it was not until 1653, when, among other things, the master agreed to teach the *Accidence*, that good evidence exists of its being a grammar school. Inferential evidence might be drawn from the fact that the salary all these years was £20, and, as there was usually a marked difference between the salary of an English and that of a Latin master, this regular salary might indicate a continuous grammar school. Future votes, however, show that the school was intermittent in grade, and that able men were not always in charge.

In 1663 the master agreed to teach "the Latin tongue so far as he can and to try for one quarter of a year how he may suit with the town." There were further interruptions. Grammar was again mentioned in 1667. There was difficulty in obtaining schoolmasters, but in 1685 an agreement was made with Mr. Holbrook "to keep the school and to teach such children as come, to read and write both English and Latin, according to his ability and their capacities." In 1691 the town was presented for not having a grammar school. During all these years the salary varied between £10 and £30. It seems fair, then, to conclude that this school was not a grammar school until the *Accidence* is mentioned in 1653.

The 1647 law seems to have had no far-reaching effect. Here are but three schools founded immediately after its passage. Newbury, in 1658, according to the court records, "upon their presentment for want of a Latin school, is to pay £5 to Ipswich Latin school, unless they by the next court provide a Latin schoolmaster according to law." There is no town record to show what they did, and the grammar school does not appear for nearly a generation later. In 1687 a committee "agreed with Mr. Seth Shove to be the Latin schoolmaster for the town of Newbury for the present year." In 1691 Latin scholars paid six pence per week. The school then was a "moving" school,

kept in three parts of the town. In 1696 the schoolmaster was offered "£30 in country pay," "provided he demand but four pence per week for Latin scholars, and teach the town's children to read, write, and cypher without pay." There are many votes relative to the grammar school after this.

A Hingham contract of 1670 says: "Henry Smith engageth that with care and diligence he will teach and instruct, until a year be expired, in Latin, Greek, and English, in writing and arithmetic." This grammar school is probably continued, though in 1690 it was voted "that the selectmen of the town shall hire a schoolmaster as cheap as they can get one, provided they shall hire a single man and not a man that have a family." At this time the town was paying taxes in milk pails. There were various grammar school votes for the next one hundred years.

Woburn made two attempts to establish a grammar school, but without success. In 1685 the selectmen appointed Mr. Samuel Carter, a Harvard graduate, "to keep a grammar school that year with a salary of £5 per annum." There were no pupils. The following year he was reappointed, but was promised only thirty shillings unless scholars came, when he should have £5. There were again no pupils, and Mr. Carter probably holds the unique place of being the only grammar schoolmaster who ever received two years' salary, meager though it was, for doing nothing.

1680-90.—Shattuck claims that Concord had a grammar school previous to 1680, but a report to the county court at Cambridge that year says: "As for grammar scholars we have none except some of honored Mr. Peter Buckley's and some of Rev. Mr. Esterbrook's, whom he himself educates." This casts doubt upon the existence of a grammar school. One must have been established soon after this, for in 1692 a committee was appointed to petition the general court "to ease us in the law relating to the grammar schoolmaster." The school was continued, however, for a few years later the pupils were charged four pence per week tuition.

1667.—The third clause of the agreement with the second schoolmaster at Northampton in 1667 was "six pence per week

to learn the *Accidence*, writing, casting accounts." But there was so much succeeding difficulty in obtaining masters that the Ipswich record almost might be repeated here, "set up but did not succeed."

In 1688 the school was given permanency, and five years later the town voted that it should be made a free grammar school for twenty years, and the master's salary was made £40, raised by rate upon the inhabitants. At the end of this twenty years the town again voted to "maintain a grammar school in the town for twenty years next coming, and to be paid by the town in the same kind and portion other taxes are paid."

Hadley received £308 out of the Hopkins legacy for grammar schools, and in 1667 this record was made: "The town have granted to and for the use of a grammar school in this town of Hadley and to be and remain perpetually to and for the use of the said school, the two little meadows, etc."

1681.—In 1681 a committee was appointed "to get a school-master to teach Latin and English." Tuition rates were fixed at twenty shillings a year for Latin scholars and sixteen shillings for English. The school is frequently mentioned from this time. In 1743 Josiah Pierce, a Harvard graduate, became master, "to instruct in reading, writing, arithmetic, Latin, and Greek." He was master of the school for eighteen years.

In Lynn, in 1700, the selectmen chose the Rev. Mr. Shepherd "to keep a grammar school," for which £30 were voted the next year. As Mr. Shepherd, the minister, had also been the schoolmaster almost continuously since 1687, it is fair to assume that this vote does not mark the beginning of the grammar school, but rather that it had always been such a school during Mr. Shepherd's term of service. In 1702 the grammar master was allowed £40, and Latin pupils were charged six pence per week.

1698.—Marblehead, in 1698, had as schoolmaster Josiah Cotton, a Harvard graduate, who soon entered the ministry, but returned and taught another half-year. In his diary he says:

The people there, being generally if not universally inclined to give their children common learning, though scholars rise but thin amongst them. There was but one that went from thence whilst I kept school, to the college. . . . There was another designed, but death put an end to the design.

This is merely circumstantial evidence of a grammar school : it probably cleared the legal demands, but lacked popularity and strength.

In the Plymouth Colony no movement was made toward this form of education until the law of 1670—

granting all such profits as may or shall accrue annually to the colony from fishing with nets or seines at Cape Cod for mackerel, bass or herring, to be improved for and towards a free school in some town in this jurisdiction, for the training up of youth in literature for the good and benefit of posterity, provided a beginning were made within one year after the said grant.

The rentals from this fishery amounted to £33 a year; the school was soon established at Plymouth, for in the court records it says :

Within the time limited there hath been a beginning made at Plymouth and hitherto continued by God's blessing with good success as upon examination may appear : and whereas the said town in general have given and granted whatsoever profits may anyway arise from or by the improvement of a considerable tract of upland and meadow belonging to the said town of Plymouth, lying at Agawam, Sepecan and places adjacent, for and towards the maintenance and upholding of the said school at Plymouth; as also since several of the town of Plymouth, out of their good affections, have fully given out of their own estates, for the erecting or procuring a convenient school-house, not only for the better accommodating of the scholars, but also for the schoolmaster to live and reside in.

The court gladly takes this trust "to encourage and carry on the said well begun work at New Plymouth so long as God shall be pleased to afford any competency of means and convenient number of scholars."

1672.—It did not become a grammar school probably until 1672, when Mr. Corlett, from Harvard, was elected master. In this same year the town voted unanimously, as referred to in the court record, that their land at "Sepecan, Agawam and places adjacent, the profits and benefits thereof, shall be improved and employed for and toward the maintenance of the free school now begun and erected at Plymouth."

The new master devoted himself so zealously to Latin and Greek that the people became dissatisfied, and in 1674 voted that the children "be taught to write and cypher besides that which the country expects from the said school."

In 1677 a law was passed "that in whatsoever township in this government consisting of fifty families or upwards any meet man shall be obtained to teach a grammar school," the town making a reasonable appropriation, "the profits arising from the Cape fisheries heretofore ordered to maintain a grammar school in the Colony, shall be distributed to such towns as have such grammar schools, not exceeding £5 per annum to any one town," unless there was some good reason why the court treasurer should grant more.

Like the Massachusetts Bay law of thirty years previous, this law affixed a penalty :

And further this Court orders that every such town as consists of seventy families or upwards, and hath not a grammar school therein, shall allow and pay unto the next town which hath such grammar school kept up amongst them, the sum of £5 per annum, in current merchantable pay.

1677.—This same year, Duxbury had a grammar school, kept by Mr. Wiswall, the pastor, and the court order of 1681-2, distributing the Cape money, awarded £8 "to Mr. Ichabod Wiswall's school at Duxbury." He continued the school until 1700.

In 1678 the court gave away £10 of the Cape money, £5 to a widow "and the other £5 to the schoolmaster at Rehoboth in reference to the order of court disposing such pay to be improved towards the keeping of a grammar school in each town of this jurisdiction, as in the said order is expressed."

Although there is no mention of a grammar school in the town records at this time, there is circumstantial evidence in a record of 1680, where a schoolmaster was engaged at a salary of £20 and diet, "besides what the Court doth allow in that case." This allusion to the Cape money, the amount of salary, and the award of £5 in 1678, and another of £12 in 1681-2 prove fairly well that a grammar school was founded in Rehoboth in 1678. There are later votes showing such a school was well established. In 1708 there was an agreement with a schoolmaster "to instruct in reading, writing, *grammar*, and arithmetic," and in 1712 the school appropriation was made with the understanding that the old part of the town "be obliged to maintain a grammar school."

1682.—Bristol, afterward set off to Rhode Island, in 1683 voted "the selectmen to look out a grammar schoolmaster and use their endeavor to attain £5 of the Cape money granted for such an end." There is no proof that such a school was begun, and Bristol was not named in the money distribution of 1683; yet in 1699 scholars paid four pence a week for their Latin.

The distribution of the Cape money in 1682-3, the last recorded, awarded £12 to Barnstable school, £8 to Duxbury, £5 to Rehoboth, and £3 to Taunton. Swansea is not mentioned, though in 1673 it was voted "to set up a school for rhetoric, arithmetic, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew."

It is also worthy of note that Plymouth is not mentioned in any of this distribution. It was not until 1699 that any record pointed toward a town grammar school. In that year the price for every scholar "that comes to write or cypher or to learn Latin" was fixed at three pence per week.

Thatcher, in his *History of Plymouth*, says "there was no grammar schoolmaster until 1699," evidently basing his view on the above vote; while Goodwin, in *The Pilgrim Republic*, says:

In 1685 a Latin school was ordered in each of the new shire towns (Plymouth, Barnstable and Bristol). Each pupil from those towns was to pay three pence a week for English branches and six pence when he comes to his grammar.

After 1699 there is no doubt as to the continuance of a grammar school in Plymouth. In 1705 the cost of Latin was made four pence for scholars within one mile of the schoolhouse, two pence for those over one mile and within two miles, and free for those beyond the two-mile limit.

The Plymouth Colony law seems never to have been enforced through the courts as the Massachusetts Bay law was, but after the union of the two colonies in 1692, and the Bay law of 1647 was extended over the engrafted colony, enforcement began. Taunton, in 1697, "then did make choice of Mr. Samuel Danforth to keep a grammar school here in Taunton this present year." This vote was caused by a presentment at court, in answer to which one of the selectmen, Philip King, appeared, "The said King producing in this court a letter from Mr. Dan-

forth, the minister, signifying his approval of keeping a grammar school for this year."

The letter, in part, reads:

This may certify that a school has been kept in my house for above one whole year past for the instruction of children in reading, writing, and cyphering, to which many children came and any might, and others would have come, only the poverty of their parents, these hard times, prevented. As for any that were willing to learn Latin, etc., I have been willing to teach myself ever since I came to Taunton, but one yet came and him I taught as far as parents desired.

Sandwich had a schoolmaster in 1679, because his tax rate was abated "for his encouragement." Ten pounds were appropriated for salary in 1695, and the same amount in 1699, when he was called "The Grammar schoolmaster." Though called by this name, he was "to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic." This fact, his small salary, and the fact that in 1707 an appropriation of £20 was made to obtain a master "to instruct the children in reading, writing, arithmetic, and Latin," with the additional proviso that "they who send shall pay £10 more," proves the name a misnomer, and rather precludes Sandwich from the list of towns having grammar schools previous to 1700.

Barnstable, which received a portion of the Cape money in 1683, and is credited by Goodwin with having a grammar school in 1685, does not mention any school in her records until 1713.

In Connecticut the New Haven Colony, as early as 1641,

Ordered, that a free school shall be set up in this town, and our pastor, Mr. Davenport, together with the magistrates, shall consider what yearly allowance is meet to be given to it out of the common stock of the town, and also what rules and orders are meet to be observed in and about the same.

According to which order, £20 a year was paid to Mr. Ezekiel Cheever, the present schoolmaster, for two or three years, at first, but that not proving a competent maintenance, in August 1644, it was enlarged to £30 a year and so continueth.

Mr. Cheever was in the band which left Boston in 1638 to found New Haven, and Michael Wigglesworth, in his diary, records the fact that he learned Latin at a school kept at his house in 1639. There is every evidence to show that this first school, of which he was master, was a Latin grammar school.

Through church troubles he left the school in 1647, and the master who followed him became discouraged because "so many children came to him to be taught their letters and so few to study the classics." Troubles multiplied until finally, in 1660, the town school was given up for a colony grammar school, for which £40 was to be paid from the colony treasury. The school was situated at New Haven. A schoolhouse was provided by the town and certain lands were granted. Jeremiah Peck was engaged as master, who was required "to teach the scholars Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and fit them for the college."

The Jurisdiction records of 1661 contain a lengthy reference to this school; though its full quotation however, sheds much light on the status of the school.

There were sundry propositions presented by Mr. Peck, schoolmaster, to this court, as follows:

1. That the schoolmaster shall be assisted with the power and counsel of any of the honored magistrates or reverend elders, as he finds need or the case may require.
2. That Rectores Scholæ be now appointed and established.
3. What is it that the jurisdiction expects from the master, whether anything besides instruction in the languages and oratory.
4. That two indifferent men be appointed to provide and send to the master such scholars as be fitted for his tuition.
5. That two men be appointed to take care of the school, to repair and supply necessities as the case may require.
6. Whether the master shall have liberty to be at neighbor's meetings once every week.
7. Whether it may not be permitted that the school may begin, be it at eight of the clock all the winter half year.
8. That the master shall have liberty to use any books that do or shall belong to the school.
9. That the master shall have liberty to receive into and instruct in the school, scholars sent from other places out of this jurisdiction, and that he shall receive the benefit of them over and above what the jurisdiction doth pay him.
10. That the master may have a settled habitation not at his own charge.
11. That he shall have a week's vacation in the year, to improve as the case may require.
12. That his person and estate shall be rate free in every plantation of this jurisdiction.
13. That one-half of the year's payment shall be made to and accounts closed with the master within the compass of every half year.

14. That £40 per annum be paid to the schoolmaster by the Jurisdiction Treasurer, and that £10 per annum be paid to him by New Haven Treasurer.

15. That the major part of the aforesaid payments shall be made to the schoolmaster in these particulars, as follows, viz.: 30 bushels of wheat, 2 barrels of pork, and 2 barrels of beef, 40 bushels of indian corn, 30 bushels of pease, 2 firkins of butter, 100 pounds of flax, 30 bushels of oats.

Lastly, that the honored Court would be pleased to consider of and settle these things this Court time, and to confirm the consequent of them, the want of which things, especially some of them, doth hold the master under discouragement and unsettlement; yet these things being suitably considered and confirmed, if it please the honored Court farther to improve him who at present is schoolmaster, although unworthy of such respect and weak for such a work, yet his real intention is to give up himself to the work of a Grammar School, as it shall please God to give opportunity and assistance.

The Court considering of these things, did grant as follows; viz.: To the 2d, they did desire and appoint (naming three men) to take that care and trust upon them; to the 3d, they declared that besides that which he expressed, they expected he should teach them to write as far as was necessary to his work; to the 4th, they declared that they left it to those before mentioned; to the 8th, they declared that he should have the use of those books, provided a list of them be taken; and the 9th, they left to the committee for the school; and the rest they granted in general, except the pork and butter; and for that they did order that he should have one barrel of pork and one firkin of butter, provided by the Jurisdiction Treasurer, though it be with some loss to the jurisdiction, and that he should have wheat for the other barrel of pork. This being done, Mr. Peck seemed to be very well satisfied.

But the school did not succeed, and in three years it was abandoned, and the town school was re-established. The qualifications of succeeding masters were rather meager, and the Latin teaching was very inferior. In 1676 the town was presented for not having a grammar school. An attempt was made in 1677 to get a master who could teach the languages, but without success, and a similar attempt was made in 1681.

The will of Edward Hopkins, 1657, left some of his New England property "which is to give some encouragement in those foreign plantations for the building up of hopeful youths both at the grammar school and college, for the public service of the country in future times." This fund became available in 1664, Hartford received £400, New Haven £412, and Hadley

the balance. In 1684 the New Haven school had so far become solidified as to have been put under the following rules:

Orders of the Committee of Trustees for the Grammar School at New Haven to be observed and attended in the said school, made, agreed upon, and published in the said school in the year 1684.

1. The erection of the said school being principally for the instruction of hopeful youth in the Latin tongue and other learned languages, so far as to prepare such youths for the college and public service of the country in church and commonwealth, the chief work of the schoolmaster is to instruct all such youths as are or may be by their parents or friends sent or committed unto him to that end, with all diligence, faithfulness and constancy, out of any of the towns of this country of New Haven, upon his salary account only, otherwise gratis. And if any boys are sent to the master of the said school, from any other part of the colony or country, each such boy or youth to pay ten shillings to the master, at or upon his entrance into the said school.

2. That no boys be admitted into the said school for the learning of English books, but such as have been before taught to spell their letters well, and begin to read, thereby to perfect their right spelling and reading, or to learn to write and cypher, or numeration and addition and no further, and that all others either too young and not instructed in letters and spelling, and all girls be excluded as improper and inconsistent with such a grammar school as the law enjoins, and is the design of this settlement, and that no boys be admitted from other towns for the learning of English without liberty and special license from the Committee.

3. That the master and scholars duly attend the school hours, viz., from six in the morning to eleven in the forenoon, and from one o'clock in the afternoon to five o'clock in the afternoon in summer and four in winter."

4. Refers to attendance.

5. The school shall be opened with prayer.

6. That prayer being ended, the master shall assign to everyone of his scholars their places of sitting according to their degrees of learning, and that (having their parts or lessons appointed them) they keep their seats, and stir not out of doors without leave of the master, and not above two at one time, and so successively unless in cases of necessity.

7. Refers to behavior at school.

8. Refers to behavior at church.

9. That no Latin boys be allowed upon any pretence (sickness and disability excepted) to withdraw or absent themselves from school, without liberty granted them by the master, and that no such liberty be granted but upon ticket from the parents or friends, and on grounds sufficient as in cases of extraordinary or of absolute necessity.

10. That all the Latin scholars and all other of the boys of competent age and capacity, give the master an account of one passage or sentence at

least, of the sermons the foregoing Sabbath, on the second day morning. And that from one to three in the afternoon of every last day of the week, be improved by the master in catechising of his scholars that are capable.

After the union of the two Connecticut colonies, in 1665, the court of elections for the colony of Connecticut took some decisive steps toward the support of grammar schools. In 1672 it "granted to the county towns of Fairfield and New London the sum of 600 acres of land apiece—to be improved in the best manner that may be for the benefit of a grammar school in the said county towns." In 1677 towns neglecting to maintain schools according to law, were made subject to a yearly fine of £5, "which said fine shall be paid towards the maintenance of the Latin school in their county." If county towns neglected "to keep a Latin school according to order, there shall be paid a fine of £10 by the said county towns to the next town in their county, that will engage to keep a Latin school in it, and so £10 annually till they shall come up to the attendance of this order."

In 1690, it was further enacted :

This court considering the necessity and great advantage of good literature, do order and appoint that there shall be two free schools kept and maintained by this colony, for the teaching of all such children as shall come there, after they can first read the Psalter, to teach such reading, writing and arithmetic, the Latin and Greek tongues, the one at Hartford, the other at New Haven.

These various enactments bore fruit, for it is recorded in 1700, "Four grammar schools are constantly kept by the four county towns of this colony," Hartford, New Haven, New London, and Fairfield.

In New London, in 1698, the town voted a rate of one half penny "for the use of a free school that shall teach children to read, write and cypher, and the Latin tongue." A principal was engaged for eight years. Beyond these county towns grammar schools were few. Farmington, in 1683, voted to get "a man that is so accomplished as to teach children to read and write and teach the grammar," and ten years later, "a man that is in a capacity to teach both Latin and English."

Windsor was presented in 1672 and fined £5 "for not pro-

curing and maintaining a grammar school, said fine to be paid over to the Hartford grammar school." In 1674 a Mr. Cornish was schoolmaster at a salary of £36. This would indicate that there was a grammar master, though such a school is not mentioned by vote until 1698, when it was "agreed with Mr. Samuel Wolcott to keep a reading and writing and cyphering and grammar school for one full year." His salary was £35.

The Windsor fine shows that Hartford had a grammar school in 1672. There is presumptive evidence that her school was early established. The school taught by John Higginson in 1639, and by William Collins, "a young scholar and preacher from Barbadoes," in 1640, was without doubt a grammar school. The first school record, December 6, 1642, "It is agreed that £30 a year shall be settled upon the school by the town, forever," indicates an existing school; and the amount, a grammar school. In 1643 Mr. Andrews was master, and in 1648 John Russell, son of Rev. John Russell, of Wethersfield, a Harvard master of arts, was master, with salaries pointing toward schools of grammar grade. The course of the school, from obtainable records, seems erratic; it lacked funds, lacked public support, and probably soon lapsed into a common school, to be revived as a county school.

In 1674 Mr. Caleb Watson is "encouraged" as master by a salary of £60.

And for the encouragement of the inhabitants of this town to send their children to school, the town do engage, so long as they shall continue the said Mr. Watson in that work, that the children of this town shall go free of charge to the school.

The town agreed to raise £30 of the salary "upon the inhabitants." This agreement held until annulled by vote of the town in 1687.

In New Hampshire it is doubtful if a grammar school existed except at Portsmouth. In 1696 that town voted "an able schoolmaster be provided for the town as the law directs, not vicious in conversation."

This doubtless refers to a grammar schoolmaster, for in 1697 the rate for "Latiners" was made 24 shillings for the year,

and future records show that the grammar school was continued, though masters were not always to be had easily.

Exeter may have had one, as Pormont, the ex-Boston *brother*, was schoolmaster here for five years. Bell, in his *Exeter Quarter Millennial*, says:

And there is no reason to believe that the line of instructors of which he was the head, was ever afterwards broken. We know that during the next century they were, almost to a man, college graduates.

From these records it seems safe to list the New England grammar schools in this order:

Boston, 1635-36.	Windsor, Conn. (1674), 1698.
Salem, 1637.	Duxbury, 1677.
Charlestown, 1636.	Rehoboth, 1678.
Dorchester, 1639.	Concord (before 1680), about 1690.
New Haven, 1639.	Bristol, 1682.
Hartford, 1639.	Barnstable, 1682-85, perhaps.
Cambridge, 1640-43.	Taunton, 1682, perhaps; 1697.
Roxbury, 1645.	Farmington, Conn., 1683.
Braintree, 1645-46.	Woburn, 1685; unsuccessful.
Watertown, 1650.	Lynn (1687), 1700.
Ipswich, 1651.	Portsmouth, N. H., 1696; probably earlier.
Dedham, 1653.	New London, Conn., 1698.
Newbury (1658), 1687.	Marblehead, 1698; doubtful.
Northampton, 1667.	Sandwich, 1699; doubtful.
Hadley (1667), 1681.	Fairfield, Conn., before 1700, probably.
Hingham, 1670.	Exeter, N. H., before 1700, probably.
Plymouth, county, 1671; town, 1699.	
Swansea, 1673, doubtful.	

This list shows that in two generations twenty-six grammar schools were surely begun—seven, perhaps, and one was attempted, but lacked popular support. At this time there were eighty-one towns in Massachusetts. It is unfortunate that the population of these towns cannot be ascertained, to enable us to know how fully they conformed to the law. The 1765 census in Massachusetts showed 184 towns, of which only eighty-one had over a thousand inhabitants. From this it might be inferred that the proportion of towns having grammar schools in 1700 was as large as it should be—that, in fact, towns had generally complied with the law. But another view is

obtained from a list of polls given in by twenty towns in Middlesex county (Mass.) in 1708. Nine of the twenty showed more than one hundred families, but only five had attempted a grammar school, and but four had succeeded in its establishment. The list of Harvard graduates from 1644 to 1700 shows that some towns credited with grammar schools did not send a single student to the college, while other towns, like Salisbury, Plymouth in 1646, Dedham, Ipswich, and Concord, before schools were established, sent students, evidently prepared by the ministers of the towns. The great body of them came from the well established and continuous schools at Boston, Cambridge, Roxbury, and Charlestown. When all obtainable light has been shed upon the subject, but one conclusion can be reached: the grammar school was not a "popular" institution; it was conceived, supported, and perpetuated by the few; its extension was slow, its course in most towns erratic; and yet, when taken into consideration with all the struggles of this period, it was a marvelous institution, the bed rock of future educational systems.

WALTER H. SMALL.

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Providence, R. I.

THE TEACHING OF FIRST-YEAR LATIN.¹

Nor long ago I read with much interest a paper by Professor Johnston, of the University of Indiana, on the teaching of second-year Latin. He began with the statement that the work of the second year is very generally disappointing to the teachers, and closed with the following summing up of suggestions: Make the assignment of work absolutely definite, so precise that the pupil may anticipate every question you ask. Preserve the emphasis throughout the year; don't shift it from term to term, much less from week to week or from day to day. Make good English translations the important thing. Don't make a little tin god of the word "thoroughness;" leave something for the pupil to learn the next day; be thankful that he translates an ablative correctly, even if he can't name it. Lastly, don't make the little girl cry. It seems to me that Mr. Johnston's opening sentence is quite as true of the first year of Latin as of the second—for who will deny that the results are generally very disappointing?—and that his suggestions apply equally well to the first year, and, if carried out then, would leave less cause for the little girl's tears in the second.

But, admirable as his suggestions are, there are certain peculiar conditions and difficulties that surround the work of the first year that call for special consideration and treatment. The difficulties are inherent in the language itself, the conditions are the character of the secondary-school curriculum, the available text-books, and the methods employed in teaching. Let us consider these in order.

The language.—With most students Latin is the first language studied. From a native tongue, made up of short detached sentences and uninflected parts of speech, they are introduced to the periodic structure and highly inflected language of the Romans. No amount of enthusiasm can blind us to the fact that

¹A paper read at the May meeting of the "Chicago and Cook County High School Principals' Association."

Latin is hard. After twenty-five years of conscientious study, I am more than ever impressed with this fact, and can quite sympathize with the remark of the youthful Heine, that the reason why the Romans conquered the world was because they did not have to learn Latin. Not only is the Latin itself hard, but the ideas and civilization that it presents are perhaps even harder to the beginner. It is a different world to which he is introduced, and not a mere difference in speech. That is undoubtedly one of the reasons why children find the modern languages so much easier than Latin, and why American children, when abroad, so quickly find themselves at home with foreigners. But here we have a world separated from our own by a chasm of two thousand years, with different public and private life, a different religion—in fact, different in every respect. In view of all this, it is well that our boys and girls do not know what is before them when they rush into the difficulties of the first year, and it is only the sublime courage of ignorance that sustains them through the trial.

But not only are there these difficulties, but also the conditions imposed by the character of our school curriculum, the available text-books, and the methods of teaching.

The curriculum.—The Latin course in the vast majority of our secondary schools is one of four years. The number of schools giving a five- or six-years' course is so small, at least in the West, as to be practically a negligible quantity. Even in Chicago, where the signs were promising for a longer course, I am told that a longer course is at present being given in but two schools. Now, what that means for our Latin pupils is simply this: that they are expected to do as much work in one year as the German boy with more hours a week and with better teachers does in two or even three years. The two lowest classes in the gymnasia of Prussia and Bavaria give eight hours a week to Latin; in Saxony, Baden, and Hesse they give nine, and in Wurtemberg they give ten. In no case do they think of reading Cæsar till the third or fourth year. Under these circumstances, can we be surprised that our pupils come up to the second year with a very limited vocabulary, slow and uncertain

apprehension of forms, and a very hazy notion of syntactical possibilities. In a word, they are only half prepared; and while they attack their history, mathematics, and science lessons with the conscious power of achievement, they have to struggle desperately to keep their heads above water in Latin, and have the constant and growing feeling that it is a little too much for them. Many sink in the struggle and only the most vigorous survive, "Rari nantes in gurgite vasto."

The text-books.—Professor Bennett, of Cornell, in his recent book on the "Teaching of Latin and Greek," scores the current Beginners' Latin Books with much justice. But they reflect, as well as determine, the methods of teaching most employed, and the fact of their acceptance and well nigh universal use seems to show that teachers generally are satisfied with them. The fact is that we are still in a transition from the old to the new régime in aims and methods, and until we are fully committed to the new the present books will be used. Under the old régime, when the doctrine of former culture sat enthroned, the disciplinary value of the classics was the all-sufficient argument for their pursuit; rules were valuable in proportion to their difficulty and the number of exceptions, and students were reasonably in doubt whether the subjunctive was made for man or man for the subjunctive. Against this senseless exaltation of grammar and syntax there was a natural revolt. We are now supposed to have left this behind, and our professed aim is to lead the pupil by the shortest and easiest way to a reading knowledge of the language; grammar, and syntax being valuable only so far as they assist in accomplishing this result. This, I say, is our professed aim and purpose, but we are still in no small degree exalting syntax with beginners beyond what is wise or pedagogically sound, and we are doing it at the expense of other things that are of much more importance to a pupil at that stage of progress. In the first year forms and vocabulary should have the first place with a minimum of syntax. In actual practice forms and syntax are neck and neck in the race for preferment, with vocabulary hopelessly in the rear. And yet the failure to read Latin easily is usually a failure to know the meanings of the words or the sig-

nificance of a form, and but rarely a weakness in syntax. What is worse, we confuse and obstruct a pupil's efforts to master his forms by compelling him to make a formal study of constructions at the same time, with the result that he learns neither well. An examination of the books and methods used in other countries, and especially of those used by *sexta* and *quinta*, the two lowest classes in German schools, shows a very different condition of affairs. These two years the pupil spends with scarcely any formal study of syntax, and the whole first year passes without taking up formally a single subjunctive construction. On the other hand, he has learned *thoroughly* the declensions and conjugations, and has acquired a large vocabulary by the systematic making and learning of word lists and the copious reading of simple Latin. In this translating he is taught to recognize the simplest constructions; but they are not taken up formally for study.

At the end of two years he has met in his reading, and can recognize, the following: direct and indirect object, the ablative with special verbs, the ablative of time, the genitive with adjectives, clauses with *ut* and *ne*, the three forms of condition, the accusative of time and space, the accusative with the infinitive, the constructions with names of towns, and the commoner uses of participles. The formal study of constructions is taken up in the third and fourth years, largely by the inductive study of what has been read during the first two years. Of course our curriculum does not permit of our following this method in full, but it suggests that we make too much of syntax, and not enough of forms and vocabulary. It suggests, too, that our beginners' books are seriously in error when they shift the emphasis now to this thing and then to that from day to day and from week to week. One thing at a time, and that done well, is as good a rule here as elsewhere. Another more serious error for which the beginners' books are responsible, an error to which Professor Bennett¹ also calls attention in the book mentioned above, is that these manuals not only attempt to teach forms and syntax at the same time, but that there is no per-

¹ *The Teaching of Latin and Greek*, BENNETT and BRISTOL, p. 54.

ceptible plan in the presentation of material. In this they violate every known law of psychology and pedagogy. Surely it is axiomatic that things belonging together should be taught together, and that by the very structure of our minds we remember most easily things which stand in a recognized logical relation to each other. But the beginners' book, on the plea of variety and creation of greater interest, gives us now a bit of the the noun, then of the adjective, then of the verb, then a little more of the noun again, and so on, while a similar lack of coherence marks the presentation of the syntax. Surely the five declensions of nouns are intimately connected, and can be best learned and remembered in association, the same is true of the declension of the other parts of speech and of the four conjugations. So, too, the different divisions of the genitive, dative, accusative, etc., are best learned in relation the one to the other. Every Latin Grammar recognizes this tacitly in the arrangement of its material. What would we think of a grammar that did not do so! And yet we are asked to spread these *disiecta membra* before young and helpless pupils, with the unwarranted hope that by some miraculous process of their untrained and immature minds they will be able to make out of this chaos a well ordered and systematized knowledge of the essentials of the language. The beginners' book of today is a great improvement over the Latin Reader of a generation ago, in so far as students are at once introduced to the complete sentence, and not kept for weeks on a monotonous and juiceless pabulum of isolated words and meaningless phrases, but I feel that this advantage has been purchased at a great loss in the thoroughness and accuracy which can come only from well systematized and integrated knowledge. Teachers that have been in the work as long as I, and can remember the boys that came up to college under the old régime, or can remember their own schooling under it, will agree with me that boys then knew their grammar much better than they do now, and especially their forms. We studied the grammar directly in those days, taking up each subject in its logical order, and for drill we had the Latin Reader, based upon and following the order of the gram-

mar. The work lacked the variety of the methods of today, but it was strongly concentrative, and was by no means lacking in interest.

But the beginners' book, with all its faults, has probably come to stay. It is a convenience, and appeals to the ignorance of the untried teacher and the inertia of the experienced ones. Further, it is cheap—which is an unanswerable argument to the average school board. This being a condition, and not a theory, what are we going to do about it? and how may the work of the first year be made fairly successful in spite of the evils that so sorely beset us? The first thing to do is to keep clearly in mind the aim in view, and to admit nothing that does not minister directly to this object. This aim I take to be to lead the pupil as directly and as easily as possible to a good reading knowledge of Latin. Questions that come up for consideration during the first year are mainly the following: (1) How shall we teach pronunciation, how much attention shall we give to it and to the marking of vowels? (2) How may a large vocabulary best be acquired? (3) How shall forms be taught? (4) How much syntax shall be taught, and how is a working knowledge of syntax best imparted? (5) What is the relative value of translating from Latin into English and from English into Latin? (6) What should we read?

1. How shall we teach pronunciation? How much attention shall we give to it and to the marking of vowels?

On this subject I quote from the *Prussian Courses of Study*, p. 23, the following: "The burdening of instruction with the refinements of pronunciation is not to be recommended." The essentials of pronunciation are best taught by imitation. No time should be wasted by a beginner on learning rules of the sounds of letters. He will learn these much better from the lips of his teacher, who should always read clearly and distinctly, especially during the opening weeks, every sentence before it is read by the pupil, and should also pronounce each new vocabulary before it is assigned as a lesson. It is easy to carry the refinements of pronunciation too far, and to give it too much time relative to its importance. I believe that we should be

satisfied to concentrate our attention on the last two syllables of the word, paying particular attention to the accent. That is as much as the Germans pretend to do even in their seminary courses in the universities. The result is that you rarely if ever hear a German student make a mistake in the accent of a word, while we, in attempting to secure more, fail of even that. We are just now under special stress in this matter because the matter of quantity is at present something of a hobby among American philologists. While we all rejoice with them that many of the uncertainties of quantity have been cleared up, we quite agree with Professor Bennett when he says: "Many college teachers, in their enthusiasm for the scientific aspects of their own professional work, exhibit a tendency to demand that the teaching of their own subject in the secondary schools shall be conducted with express reference to the ultimate needs of the higher scholarship."¹ So, in this matter of quantity, if we follow the lead of the specialists, we shall fall into the grievous error of spending our time in the tithing of mint and anise and cummin, while neglecting the weightier matters of the law. Especially is this true in the first year where so much that is absolutely fundamental is pressing for the most earnest attention. From what I have said thus far on this theme you will readily infer that I do not believe in asking beginners to memorize quantities, more particularly not the hidden quantities. I doubt if there be a single Latinist in the country that could mark correctly all the quantities in the first ten pages of Cæsar, even provided that they were all known, which they are not. Yet, only yesterday I was reading a paper in an educational journal on the teaching of first-year Latin, in which particular stress was laid on the necessity of having pupils mark *all* the quantities. I have myself a daughter who is attending a school where this task is imposed on the beginners' class. I recently looked over some of her work and found that the quantities were marked with conscientious accuracy. But when I tested her on the declensions and conjugations she showed painful weakness, and her vocabulary—well, the less said about that the better. Is it not

¹ *The Teaching of Latin and Greek*, BENNETT and BRISTOL, p. 80.

clear that here was a serious blunder in teaching, a lack of perspective, an undue and disastrous emphasis on non-essentials? And I fear that the same mistake is being made in hundreds of schools. The value of knowing quantities when we come to the scansion of verse is evident, but two-thirds of the beginners in Latin will never read a line of verse. What is more, generations of men have gotten music and inspiration out of Virgil's song centuries before the subject of hidden quantities was broached in the schools. I would not have you infer from this that I undervalue the importance of accuracy in this matter. I have myself given the subject much study, and consider it an important field of research, I only wish to protest against introducing the methods of the philological seminary into the elementary school. One prominent philologist who has come to recognize the practical impossibility of infusing into beginners the quintessences of quantitative accuracy, at least if they are to learn any Latin, has gone so far as to say: "The introduction of the Roman pronunciation was a fundamental blunder, and its retention is a serious mistake." We agree, if we are to regard the matter from his point of view, but I claim that all the *really essential* features of the Roman pronunciation can be imparted to beginners from the lips of a skilful teacher with little expenditure of time and effort, that this pronunciation can be gradually refined by constant practice and experience, and especially by the use of texts with marked quantities. I should require no marking of quantities from beginners, or, at most, only in final syllables and penultimate vowels long by nature before a single consonant. As for hidden quantities and what not, about them I should never allow them to vex their dear little souls.

2. How may a large vocabulary best be acquired?

As has been already said, lack of vocabulary is the chief obstacle to rapid reading. Unfortunately nowhere is our instruction apt to be more lacking in system and thoroughness. The foundation for a large vocabulary can and should be laid during the first year. That is the period of life when the power of memory is the strongest, and that advantage should be fully utilized. In the German schools the boys begin to learn Latin

words even before they enter the gymnasium. A little friend of mine, an American boy, who spent two years in the grades preparatory to the gymnasium, in what with us would be the fourth and fifth grades, returned to this country with not only a good knowledge of German, but also with a vocabulary of three or four hundred Latin words which he had absorbed almost unconsciously by having had them in his writing lessons. No special time or effort was given to it, but it was just so much clear gain. It occurs to me that the same practice of using Latin words in penmanship in the grades instead of English for such pupils as will take up Latin later, would not be impossible. But having begun the study of Latin, practically all that we attempt is to require the translation of the exercises in the beginners' book, with, perhaps, a little independent drill on the vocabulary itself. I know no point where our beginners' books are weaker or need more supplementing than right here. The cardinal point with a vocabulary at this stage is that the words in it should be words of frequent occurrence, and such as are found in the elementary classics that are to follow. But these vocabularies in question not infrequently contain words that are not found in the first classic read, and I have noted a few that are very rare in any Latin. But even if these vocabularies were not open to this criticism, and even if they were thoroughly learned, as they are not in many cases, there is needed much systematic supplementary work. One way in which the vocabulary may be made to grow is by wide reading, and the supplementary reading to be done the first year, a point on which I will touch presently, will minister to this end. But reading is more useful as a means for retaining words already learned than for adding new ones. The following means have been tested and found effective:¹ Let the pupils arrange from what they read, lists of words, grouping together first the different parts of speech, and then classifying the nouns and adjectives by their suffixes, and the verbs by their conjugation. In this way they will soon come to learn the force of the different suffixes, and an important lesson

¹ Cf. DETTWEILER in Baumeister's *Handbuch der Erziehungs- und Unterrichtslehre für höhere Schulen*, p. 109 ff.

in the formation of words will have been learned. This should not be carried too far, but only the most important and significant facts pointed out. When this has been done, groups of words can be built related in meaning or in derivation. This work is not only very valuable but can be made very interesting if done in class, as it should be, by a live and skilful teacher. A further, and perhaps equally effective method, is to have the class keep in their notebooks groups of words that have to do with some of the usual subjects of their acquaintance and reading. Whenever a new word is met it should be put in its proper group. This, again, is a class exercise, to be done under the guidance of the teacher. For example, a series of groups may be built under the following heads: The City; Its Inhabitants; Their Classes and Occupations; The Government of the City; Qualifications of the Magistrates; The Opposites of these Qualifications; The Duties of the Magistrates; The Sights of a City. Under the first head, "The City," let the students write *urbs, oppidum*. Under the second, "Its Inhabitants," *cives, incolae, homines, viri, mulieres, feminae, senes, filii, filiae, pueri, liberi*, etc.; also the verbs *incolere, habitare*. Under the third heading, "Their Classes and Occupations," have them write *agricolae, artifices, fabri, magistri, mercatores, milites, nuntii, sacerdotes, scriptores, servi*, etc., adding each word as it is met in the reading. I will not carry the illustration farther, as I think the plan is clear. The fundamental principle of all these devices is the same, namely, that words are best remembered in relations. A little time spent here, say half as much as some are giving to the marking of hidden quantities, will yield wonderful results in the ability to read Latin.

3. How shall forms be taught?

Forms share, with the vocabulary, the first place in the work of the first year. Students that do not learn them well then are apt to limp badly forever after. To our boys and girls inflection is a strange and difficult thing. His German cousin across the sea, who has absorbed *der, die, das*, and the incongruities of Teutonic genders with his mother's milk, finds all this *ganz natürlich*, but even there I have been surprised to observe how

carefully the teachers lead up to and develop the notion of case relation and case and form, the keynote to the instruction being that they in every instance work from a known phenomenon in German to its parallel in Latin. In this way they will spend three or four days on the first declension. In my younger and more confident days I did not hesitate to assign the whole of the first declension, including exercises, in a single lesson. I now think that a little more time spent here would have saved time in the end, for I am sure that many students have little conception of the real meaning and force of a case termination for a long time after they have left the first declension far behind them. Our language does not admit of the comparisons in form that the German does, but it does furnish a few that are very useful right here. To mention only one, by calling attention to the inflection of our interrogative-relative *who*, *whose*, *whom*, and the respective force of each case, we may hope for an intelligent grasp of the nominative, genitive, and accusative case, the nominative answering the question *who*, the genitive *whose*, and the accusative *whom*. Again I say, time spent here is not wasted.

It is always a temptation to a teacher of a philological turn of mind to do more than is wise with the formation of the different cases. Interesting and useful as this is for more advanced pupils, it is doubtless true that it is much easier for the child to remember a form as a whole than it is to remember its constituent parts and construct it. This is still more true where the formations are difficult and hard to trace, as in the case forms. I am even in doubt whether we do not lose more in good pedagogy than we gain in scientific accuracy when we tell a boy that the stem of nouns of the first declension ends in *ā* and in the second in *o*, in view of the fact that the stem vowel fails to appear in so many of the cases. This puzzles and confuses the pupil far more than the scientific truth helps him. For all practical and useful ends I think it would be quite as useful to teach beginners that the stem of a word is the part that does not change, and the variable part the termination. On the other hand, there are some matters of formation that should be pointed

out because they have a positive value in the identification of forms. Chief among these are the tense signs of the verb.

Another danger is that we may teach forms that have no practical value in actual use, or burden the memory with useless rules and exceptions that have come down to us from the ages and still find a place in many grammars and beginners' books. For example there is the hackneyed rule that names of towns are feminine, whereas the fact is that names of towns follow the gender of their termination just the same as other words, apparent exceptions being when foreign towns keep the gender of their native language, for example *Corinthus* being fem. in Greek remains so in Latin, while *Bibracte* being neuter in Celtic remains so. The rules for gender in the third declension with their numerous exceptions are of little practical value. Of them all there are not more than five or six that are useful. In this same declension pupils should be taught the principal rules by which we distinguish the I stems; beyond that I should teach them only that masc. and fem. have *ium* in the gen. plur. and *is* or *es* in the acc. plur., and that neut. I stems have *i* in the abl. sing., *ia* in the nom. and acc. plur. and *ium* in the gen. plur. Further minutiae are not necessary at this stage of progress. If students learn more it is apt to be *in futuram oblivionem*. In the fourth declension the apparent irregularity of *-ubus* instead of *-ibus* is only a difference in orthography, *tribus* being the only word that has only *-ubus*. This matter may therefore be safely omitted with beginners. In the conjugation of the verb the grammars, for the sake of system presumably, give a third person imperative and a passive imperative, practically, however, these forms do not appear in actual use and may be omitted. The same may be said of the forms of *eo* in the perfect tenses with inserted *v*. This *v* is always thrown out, and when *s* follows *ii*, contraction takes place. These are only a few of the cases where the work on forms can be simplified and abbreviated.

I need scarcely emphasize the absolute necessity for thorough drill here. It is the *sine qua non* for the mastery of the language. German writers on Latin pedagogy often speak of transforming the forms into the flesh and blood of their pupils, and indeed

the expression is none too strong for the necessity of the case. The beginners' books by parceling out forms in homeopathic doses at long intervals, seem to shrink from attacking them boldly and conquering them. But that is what must be done, and it seems to me of vital importance that we take considerable time at intervals during the first year to give thorough drill on the declensions *en masse*, with no false and artificial divisions, and the same with the four conjugations.

4. How much syntax shall be taught and how is a working knowledge of syntax best imparted?

My views on the first of these questions have already been fairly well exploited in the foregoing pages. I, therefore, simply repeat that forms and vocabulary having the first place, syntax comes in for a minor share of attention. Let the weight of instruction be on the former. The principal constructions are soon recognized and correctly translated, and that is all that should be attempted. The formal study of syntax does not belong here. Let whatever is done with syntax be of a fundamental character, the rules and usages that are followed by all the best writers, omitting all that is unusual or peculiar to individual writers.

A working knowledge of syntax is imparted by the study of rules and the examples under them, by reading and a study of the text, and by the writing of English into Latin. Most are agreed that the second of these means is the most effective, but this method belongs rather to the more advanced courses, and lies outside of this discussion. What is done with syntax the first year is accomplished mainly through the other two methods. The study of rules and examples is especially open to the danger of self deception on the part of the student and a false presumption of knowledge on the part of the teacher, unless the rules are very clearly stated and the examples very simple. Even then a full and careful explanation by the teacher with copious parallel constructions from English, where such exist, seems to me imperative. We little know how much ignorance and what absurdities the glib recitation of a rule often conceals. One of our most distinguished Latinists told me that he went through

the high school reciting with great satisfaction to himself and with the approval of his teacher the astonishing statement that "*cum* casual takes the subjunctive." The study of rules and examples is usually followed by a translation of illustrative sentences from English into Latin. This, if done with thought and intelligence, is of some value, but it is apt to be a mere mechanical copying of the examples. But this leads us naturally to the next question of our discussion.

5. What is the relative value of translating from English into Latin and from Latin into English?

I presume that we are all agreed that our aim in having English translated into Latin is to increase vocabulary and to enlarge the knowledge of syntax for the use that can be made of both in the reading of Latin, rather than with the hope or design of teaching the art of writing Latin as an end in itself. To write good Latin is an elegant accomplishment the acquisition of which calls for an immense amount of labor and practice, and has come to be almost a lost art. The time has passed when the learned world found it necessary to use Latin as a means of communication, and with the passing of its practical utility the cultivation of the art began to diminish. The inherent difficulty of the work and the notoriously poor results that we obtain from it have led many to question whether we are not giving it too much time, and whether other methods of drill in vocabulary and syntax would not yield more fruit. I think this question particularly pertinent in the first year, where syntax plays a subsidiary part anyhow, and where we can employ more effective ways of teaching vocabulary. In the German gymnasias very little translation from German into Latin is called for in the lowest grades, that is written translation; but much oral drill is given with very easy sentences. That method has the advantage that many more sentences can be given orally than can be written, and that the work is done in class under the guidance of the teacher. With this method, too, the countless variations that can be made in a single simple sentence in tense, mood, case, etc., afford excellent drill in forms: a point in which the written exercise of seven or eight sentences is much inferior, for in the

preparation of these, the student is quite sure to follow the path of least resistance and copy the needed forms from his paradigms. I am of the opinion that most beginners' books give too many sentences for translation into Latin, and that most of these sentences are too hard, and that some of the time spent on these could be used to better advantage on forms and vocabulary, and the translation of Latin into English. The relation between the ability to trace out and identify Latin constructions in English forms of thought is not as closely connected with the ability to translate Latin into English as we are apt to suppose. The latter object can and often is successfully pursued without the former, and our fundamental aim is to read Latin.

The Latin text, on the contrary, and its translation into good idiomatic English is the basis and end of all our training. The text gives the material for drill on forms and the making of a vocabulary. It also gives the best introduction to the study of syntax, a knowledge of which should be gradually built up from the inductive study of the text. And the translation into English, affording as it does an unrivaled field for the study of our own language, is the chief justification for the place that Latin fills in our curriculum. But my mention of text and translation seems to belong rather to the work of the higher classes, and naturally leads to the question of what reading, if any, should be attempted the first year.

6. What should we read?

In my opinion simple connected reading should be in the hands of beginners in Latin at the earliest possible moment, and here more than anywhere else, perhaps, the teacher needs to supplement the slender and inadequate resources of the average text-book. By omitting half of the sentences designed for translation into Latin, adequate time will be found. It was the great Ritschl who, when asked for advice in mastering Latin, said, "*Lesen, viel lesen, sehr viel lesen, sehr viel viel lesen.*" While a certain number of detached sentences continue to be necessary for illustrative purposes, the structure of the Latin sentence can be learned only from connected narrative, and it is

unfamiliarity with this, next to forms and vocabulary, that bars the gate to the young Latinist. The lack of suitable matter from the ancient classics at once presents itself, for it is a well-known fact that the Romans did not write expressly for our babes and sucklings. But there is an abundance of material, if we are wise enough to use it. Many teachers seem to think that any Latin that does not bear the classic brand is necessarily bad Latin, and will carry dangerous contagion of poor grammar and barbarous syntax into our schools. But the Latin schools of Europe have never hesitated to manufacture what was needed for their elementary classes, and have not only not suffered therefrom, but with most excellent results. And there is no reason why bad results should be feared. Much of this modern Latin is far from being poor, and some of it would not disgrace Cicero himself. Some of the best collections of this nature known to me for beginners are the following: Meurer, *Lateinisches Lesebuch für Sexta*; Perthes, *Lateinisches Lesebuch für Sexta*, also *für Quinta*; Oehler, Schubert, and Sturmhoefel, *Übungsbuch für den grammatischen Unterricht im Lateinischen für Sexta*; and Ritchie, *Fabulae Faciles*. Any enterprising teacher could easily take from such sources as these as much supplementary reading as was needed, and, by means of hektograph or typewriter, furnish his pupils with it. The selections have the following distinct advantages: they are connected Latin and not the *disiecta membra* of mutilated classical remains; they are not too hard, they develop power in the pupil and do not discourage him; they are interesting in themselves and are worth translating, a reward for the labor of translating that pupils have a right to expect; most of them in subject-matter are connected with Roman life, custom, and tradition, and are a valuable introduction to the work that follows; and, lastly, they are to be preferred to an emasculated edition of a later classic, because such preliminary reading destroys all subsequent interest in it on the part of the pupil.

I cannot close this paper without adding a word with reference to the teacher of first-year Latin, for he, after all, is a more important factor than any book or any method. I have spent

many years of my life in the preparation of Latin teachers for the secondary schools, and every now and then some half-prepared candidate for a Latin position will come to me for a recommendation and say: "I know that my preparation is deficient, but will you not recommend me for the beginners' work? I am sure I could do that." "Any year but that," I reply. Nowhere is the need greater for skill, experience and knowledge. Put the strongest and best teacher you have in charge of the first year, and a weaker one will do well enough in the second, third, or fourth. And I wish to plead in this connection, and especially for the beginners' class, for more real teaching and less mere hearing of lessons. The recitation hour should be most valuable for the development and application of new knowledge. No new principle or new matter of any description should be assigned for an advance lesson that has not been carefully and fully developed by the teacher before the pupils, and with their co-operation. My observation leads me to fear, however, that in our schools this is more usually the exception than the rule. A difficult advance lesson assigned with no explanation one day becomes the slovenly and half-prepared, because half-understood, recitation of the next; and at the end of the nervous and trying hour for both pupils and teacher he has barely time at the stroke of the bell to shout, "The next lesson in advance for tomorrow," and so the sad work goes on. I would that I were exaggerating, but I know whereof I speak. The amount of time and energy that pupils waste in misdirected and unintelligent study is appalling.

Finally, it seems to me wise that in the division of work in a high school the teachers of Latin should also be in charge of the classes in ancient history and English language. The opportunities for mutual and helpful correlation between these subjects and Latin are so numerous and obvious as not to need mention.

I conclude with a résumé of the suggestions made:

1. The essentials of a good pronunciation are best taught by imitation. The teacher should be the model. Marking of vowels is of minor importance, and should be dealt with accordingly.

2. A large vocabulary should be acquired. This is best accomplished by the systematic making and study of word lists and copious reading.

3. The thorough mastery of forms is of vital importance at this stage. Scientific explanations of formations are not in place.

4. Syntax should have a secondary place. Little formal study should be done, but the student should be taught to recognize the principal constructions in his reading.

5. The value of translating from English into Latin is sometimes overrated. On the contrary, the value of translating from Latin into idiomatic English cannot be overrated.

6. Read as much simple connected Latin as possible. Use modern sources where ancient ones fail.

7. Put the strongest teacher in charge of the beginners' class.

8. Correlate the work in English language, ancient history, and Latin.

BENJAMIN L. D'OOGHE.

MICHIGAN STATE NORMAL COLLEGE.

THE PLACE OF COMMERCIAL STUDIES IN THE HIGH SCHOOL.¹

I WILL not attempt a philosophical or pedagogical discussion of the subject of commercial education in general, but will refer to the very complete exposition of the question by Mr. Cheesman A. Herrick, director of the commercial department of the Central High School, Philadelphia.² Some of his conclusions are: Business education is a demand of the times. The secondary school must widen its course and include commercial education. Commercial courses will increase the attendance at secondary schools. Business education is valuable and necessary. Value of special training is now recognized in all other lines of activity, and it is necessary as a preparation for business. Dr. Herrick also considers commercial education in foreign countries and points out the obstacles to its inauguration in this country.

In considering the place of commercial studies in the high school, I do not wish to enter, more than is necessary, into the question of electives in the high school. But that I may make the subsequent portion of this paper clear, I shall briefly give my point of view.

Often the pupil entering the high school is very much perplexed over the selection of studies, but the pupil and his parents will be able to answer such questions as these: "Do you wish to prepare for college?" "Do you wish to go to a technical school, or a medical school, or a normal school, or do you wish a good general education?" "If you are going no further than the high school and must immediately begin to earn your living after leaving the high school, do you wish to learn a trade, go into business or into a business office?" In other words, "What is your purpose?" This much, it seems to me, can be answered

¹Delivered before the Massachusetts High School Masters' Club.

²*Supplement to the Fifth Year Book of the National Herbart Society*, 1899. University of Chicago Press.

by the parents and pupil. Now, if the boy and his parents have no definite purpose for the future, it is very unfortunate for the *boy* if he enters the high school amid a mass of electives, hoping to hit on something that will please his fancy, or by chance to find his natural bent. He needs assistance right at this point. I am aware of the fact, too, that schools supposedly organized on the freely elective plan may set so many limitations that the freedom of choice is not more unrestricted than in the school that has many separate courses of study, allowing many electives within the courses and giving a good deal of latitude in the way of substitutions. Hence the question may become one of administration, depending simply upon the judgment of the school principal for a judicious solution. I feel strongly that the question "What is your purpose?" should be constantly before the boy's mind, and it seems to me that, when the answer is received, it is the duty of the school to point the way; and the way should be blazed so definitely that the pupils may follow it in logical order and sequence. The school, then, should be arranged on the elective *course* plan. The courses should be so co-ordinated that, if the pupil finds he is on the wrong path, he may change with as little loss of time as possible. His original purpose may have been to go to college, but he finds that he cannot learn Latin, although he has shown an aptitude for mathematics. He may then decide that he prefers the technical school. He should be allowed to change to this course without loss of time, provided he has passed his one or two years in the other course. This is given simply as an illustration of what must be done in the way of co-ordination of the various courses. I believe emphatically in an increasing number of electives in each course as the work of the third and fourth year is approached.

The commercial work should be given the same standing as any of the other courses. The way should be marked out in logical sequence for the pupil, and he should be allowed optional subjects in his third and fourth years, but should be compelled to select certain of the approved conservative high-school studies, such as a modern language and science *throughout the course*.

I have spoken of these points because I fear, when we introduce into the curriculum simply commercial studies, such as bookkeeping, stenography, and commercial arithmetic, particularly under the freely elective plan or under the plan in which commercial studies are considered unimportant electives in a general course, and allow pupils to take as much or as little as they please of these subjects, that we are not adding strength to our school, neither are we gaining the approval of the public for effective work in this department. This work must be dignified by making it a department, and should be put into a school as so many separate studies, for the student will be inclined to select bookkeeping and stenography because they are easy, and because he is without any well defined purpose.

There is no question as to the public demand for the commercial course, and the high schools must listen to the demand. In our high school in Lowell, of the 600 entering in September, 1900, and in September, 1901, 228, or more than 30 per cent., selected this course. This seems to prove conclusively the public demand for commercial studies in this particular city. These 228 pupils and their parents have had opportunity to give three months' consideration to the choice of a course of study, and I believe the selection, in each case, has been made only after careful deliberation. In the past, this commercial training has been largely given by private commercial colleges. If we are going to succeed, we must equal the work of the best commercial colleges in technical training, and at the same time give a broad general education.

A tabulation of the occupations of the parents of the pupils referred to above, following a form used by Dr. Herrick, is as follows:

Independent business -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28
Clerks and salespeople -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
Skilled laborers -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61
Unskilled laborers -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30
Professional -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Quasi-professional -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
Policemen -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
Engineers -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4

Carpenters	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
Machinists	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
Firemen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Farmers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
Janitors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
No ascertainable occupation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21

The persons to whom these students are responsible are as follows :

Fathers living	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	192
Widowed mothers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25
Guardians	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11

Some of these parents are poor, hard-working people, who are determined that their boys and girls shall have a better start in life than they had themselves. This often means a hard struggle. They depend upon the high school to do this work. They do not consider the subject further, but rely absolutely upon the high school. The average citizen has absolute confidence in the public-school system, no matter how much he may criticise it. The high school must not be found wanting in the important task of educating those whose school work ends with their high-school course. I think we have failed to hold this class of pupils. These pupils will select an English course or a general course with no well defined purpose in mind. They realize all the time that when they finish their high-school course they must find employment. Upon entering the school they are usually impressed with the new conditions. They are impressed with the size of the school, and for a time will be earnest students. But they soon begin to doubt if this school work will bring them increased wages when they finally enter the business world. They cannot comprehend the purpose of the training. They begin to get restless, and the teachers now begin to put pressure on these boys because they are lagging behind the class. The boy may become disorderly or he may become a truant. At any rate, he either drops out of school or is sent out of school because we have failed to hold his interest ; we have failed to impress him with the idea that he is getting real benefit from the school. We may tell a boy who says he doesn't see the use of studying geometry that the study of geometry is one of the

finest methods of mental discipline that has ever been invented, that this study is approved by the most prominent educators that the world has known. This statement makes no impression whatever on the boy's consciousness, and he will not believe that the ability to demonstrate a certain proposition in geometry will be of material aid to him in after life. The boy who is going to college may also be rather skeptical about the value of geometry, and inclined to shirk it. We have no need to explain, as in the other case, the wonderful mental development that comes to all who study this subject. We have only to say "You must do it because your college requires it." The purpose of his school work comes before his mind, and he proceeds to learn his demonstrations without protest. This may not be the highest motive educationally, nevertheless it is a powerful one. Right here the commercial course will supply a motive and a purpose for those who have not the strong incentive that the college boy has. We can show the pupil that he will become a more efficient and successful worker, a better citizen, and take a higher stand in the community if he completes his course. The boy believes this, for there is so much that is practical in the course that it appeals to him. The boy will stay to finish his course if possible. The reputation that the course is practical will gradually spread. Parents will believe that it is valuable, and large numbers who, hitherto, have begun work at the end of the grammar-school course, will come to us, and we shall have the opportunity to make them into better citizens.

The most important part of the work in the commercial course is to teach the boys and girls (and of course it is desirable in any other course, but it is a great necessity right here with this group of pupils) habits of promptness, obedience, reliability, and alertness; and in the beginning we try to impress the idea on the mind of every pupil, that if he ever expects to be successful, he must have all of these qualities. We try to impress upon his mind that the business man will not tolerate a lack of any of these traits of character. The boy sees the purpose of such instruction, and he will acquiesce more readily than he would if you attempted to teach him geometry in the same way. We

often hear school men say that bookkeeping and stenography are not educational, apparently thinking that this settles the whole question. Whether these subjects are educational or not depends, as in the case of other studies, largely upon the intelligence and skill of the teacher.

The teachers in the commercial department form a group by themselves, and each teacher is responsible for his subject, wherever used. If a boy uses poor English in some other subject, he is turned over to his teacher of English for correction. If his penmanship and mechanical work in English are slovenly, he is sent back to his teacher of penmanship for improvement. If he is inaccurate and slow in adding columns of figures in his bookkeeping, he is turned over to the teacher of mental arithmetic for additional training, and he is taught that all of his work must be done in his best fashion.

I have in mind now a boy, one of those very slow boys, physically inactive, large, and apparently sleepy. He is in the commercial course. I can see the career of that boy in any of the other courses to be something like this: He tries his best to learn French and his English, but he is slow and it requires one minute for him to rise in his seat for a recitation; it requires three or four minutes for the teacher to draw the semblance of a response from him. The boy, as well as the teacher, is discouraged, and both teacher and pupil agree that his case is hopeless. In the mental arithmetic, greatly to the surprise of the instructor, after a few weeks' training he leads the class in rapid mental calculations; and one day, to test him, the instructor gave the mental problem with all the rapidity of which he was master. This boy was the only one to keep up with the instructor. In rapid addition made after the dictation of figures, if he succeeds in getting the figures written, he adds them faster than anybody else in the class. He is so slow, however, that sometimes he cannot get the figures down, and then he is beaten. The fact that the boy can do some kind of work better than his companions, is a revelation to him, and he is going to do all his other work very much better because he is gaining confidence in his own ability, and the commercial course has added one more

avenue by which the individual can discover the particular niche in which he belongs.

The commercial course, then, should be dignified by a name, and the various studies in it should be logically arranged as in other courses. The next problem to confront us is, What shall the course be? Shall it be a two years', three years', or four years' course? Shall we make it on the assumption that all pupils will stay with us four years, so that we may send them all into business life trained to the minute? This would be a comparatively simple program to arrange, and one in which the results would realize all our ambitions.

One of the four years' commercial courses that came to my notice in a somewhat extended investigation of the subject, which gave me very much help, was arranged for the Worcester High school. It is a four years' course, with the last year filled with commercial subjects. The first year, as I remember it, contained no commercial subjects, but was made up of the ordinary studies of the general course. The program seemed to be nearly ideal for those schools in which a four years' course could be demanded, and in which a large percentage of those who enter stay for the four years. But the high-school conditions in some cities will hardly allow of such a program if we wish to do the greatest good to the greatest number. In Lowell we have to deal with a large number of boys and girls who cannot stay with us four years. Fifty per cent. of our pupils drop out of school without graduation. The remaining 50 per cent. graduate either in the three or four years' course. For a long time we have given two diplomas—a three years' diploma for the pupil who satisfactorily completes three years' work in any course, and the other diploma for those who have completed four years' work. The same arrangement holds in the commercial course; that is, we give a diploma at the end of three years' work and at the end of four years' work.

It is evident, then, that we must allow a good deal of commercial work in the first three years if a large percentage drop out before completing three years. I will give the course as arranged for Lowell, not because it is an ideal course, but as an

illustration of a practicable working course that fits our own conditions and co-ordinates with the established courses of the school. It is as follows :

First year.—Algebra, mental arithmetic, commercial geography, penmanship, correspondence, bookkeeping, and English ; all prescribed.

Second year.—Bookkeeping, commercial law, commercial arithmetic, history, and English, prescribed ; French, geometry, physics, elective. One subject from the latter group to be taken.

Third year.—Bookkeeping, history, and English, prescribed. Stenography and typewriting, French, German, chemistry, physiology and astronomy, elective. From the latter group two electives must be taken.

Fourth year.—Stenography and English, prescribed. French, German, chemistry, industrial history, and economics, elective. Two electives must be taken.

The study of English in the course runs through the four years and is identical with the English in the other courses. The history is similar to the history work of the other courses, but it is all taught from the commercial point of view, stress being laid upon the history of the world as having been shaped by commercial and trade conditions.

The bookkeeping does not really begin until the second half of the first year, as the time is taken up in penmanship, spelling, and correspondence, and a general attempt to shape the mechanical work of the student so that he will be able to do his work accurately and neatly. Rapid methods in arithmetic are taught in connection with the bookkeeping in the entire course.

I will not discuss the question of equipment, which must be liberal and complete ; nor the question of teachers, who must be strong, well trained, and skilful. The course must be as exacting as any other course, and it will equal any course in educational value. Furthermore, I do not wish it understood that we have accomplished everything outlined in this paper, as our course has been in operation less than two years. I have tried to present some of the motives that guided us in the introduction of the commercial course as an important department of our high school, and will say that the results thus far have exceeded our most sanguine expectations, and that I have absolute faith in the future success of this department.

CYRUS W. IRISH.

HIGH SCHOOL,
Lowell, Mass.

HIGH-SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.

"HOW FAR the Public High School is a Just Charge Upon the Public Treasury," was the title of an able paper read at the October, 1898, meeting of the New England Association¹ of Colleges and Preparatory Schools. That it is a just charge in Massachusetts has been settled by statute law and removes the question from the realm of legitimate discussion. It was shown that the expense of maintaining the public high schools in the state of Massachusetts was one-fifth of the entire school expense for the state; and it was claimed that the high schools were entitled to receive four-thirteenths of the school funds, since four of the thirteen years of the school course, from the kindergarten to high-school graduation, were included in the high-school course. It may be fairly argued that if high schools are to justify their existence as a part of the educational system of any state, it must be on some basis other than the length of the course of study. They should be willing to have the sterling business principle of "value received" applied rigorously, and for the schools that give due return, there will always be abundant and unquestioning financial support.

That high schools do not reach the masses as they should and as they can and must, will be generally admitted. To suppose that they are not alive to this condition, or that they are not making strenuous effort to widen the scope of their influence, would be at once to make a grave error and do them serious injustice.

The American high school was not designed, like its predecessor, the old academy, for a college preparatory school. Its chief and ultimate aim is the preparation of young men and women for American citizenship. The curricula of tax-supported schools must be elastic enough to respond to the pulse of reasonable popular demand. That this is being done is evidenced by the adoption of the elective, commercial, and manual-training

¹ See SCHOOL REVIEW, Vol. VI, p. 746.

courses; and by the establishment of commercial and manual-training high schools.

One frequently hears in educational gatherings or reads¹ in the daily press the statement, that a very small percentage of our public-school pupils ever gets into the high school. If the United States is taken as a base, four or five per cent. of the pupils registered in our public schools are all that are ever accredited as taking, in whole or in part, the high-school course. If different states are taken we get percentages varying from the lowest to 8 per cent., that of Massachusetts, the highest. If it is true that we are unable to attract to the high school more than three, five, or eight in each one hundred of the pupils in our public schools, then we should seriously review our course of study and inspect our school policy with the hope of ascertaining and correcting the difficulty. That this impression is quite general, one needs only to examine the speeches of our most prominent educators to determine. *The question is, does high school enrollment represent high school efficiency?*

Well-intentioned people have opposed the high school as a part of the public-school system on the ground that the public patronizes the high school to such a limited extent that the small fraction can be ignored in the general problem of public education without any material effect upon final results. These same people argue that the high school provides a liberal education for a selected few, something the public should not be required to do. They assert² that the high school is the most expensive school in the system; that higher salaries are paid the teachers; that more expensive apparatus and library facilities are required; that larger and more expensive buildings are needed; and that all of these items increase year by year; and from the statement of the educators themselves it is established that public education ends with the completion of the grammar-school course or before it. That the high school is the most expensive school in the system goes without argument; the same

¹ See *New England Journal of Education*, Vol. LIV, p. 316.

² Consult the discussion on "Unification" in New York State, 1898-9, *Educational Review*, Vol. XVII, pp. 409, 510; Vol. XVIII, pp. 43-79.

is true when we speak of clothing the man and the child, or when we compare their relative expense along any line, but this fact could hardly be used as an effective argument against the man.

While statute law has settled some things for the high schools of Massachusetts, there are still murmurings against them in that state as elsewhere. This is clearly indicated by the report¹ of Secretary Frank A. Hill, of the Massachusetts State Board of Education. In commenting upon this misuse of the ratio between high school and public school attendance, Mr. Hill takes occasion to say that the 7.6 per cent. of the entire school enrollment of the state that is found in high schools does not indicate the proportion of school children who pursue their studies beyond the elementary school; and to claim that only 7.6 per cent. enter the high school is misleading, and tends to underestimate the importance of the high school as a part of our public-school system. The state superintendent of Pennsylvania in his annual report for 1895 points out the same misuse of statistics in that state and urges that "The time has come when the teachers of our Pennsylvania high schools should correct such a serious error in the public mind."

High schools are not found in country districts or small villages; and yet the thousands of children in these localities are reckoned in as a part of the divisor in this problem, when by their geographical location they are excluded from the possibility of high-school enjoyment. Those out of the sphere of high-school influence would have to be added, as well as those within, if we are dealing with mere percentages concerning given areas. But such figures are of little value in a problem like the one before us, and are manifestly unfair. If we are to adopt the method used by these critics of the public high school, it would be a much fairer test of high-school efficiency if we should take for the divisor the total enrollment for all schools in those communities within the circle of high-school influence, and for the dividend the actual high-school enrollment in said communities. Those pupils who are taking one or more high-

¹See *Fifty-Eighth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Board of Education*, p. 67.

school studies should be reckoned in the dividend as well as in the divisor; the quotient would then be the percentage of high-school enrollment to the total school enrollment for the localities taken. With this correction, without any change of method, it would be found that a far greater number of those within the sphere of high-school influence were enjoying, in whole or in part, the advantages afforded by our high schools.

The misleading statement that less than 5 per cent. of the school population ever enter the high school is obtained by dividing the number actually enrolled in secondary schools in one year by the total school enrollment. To show the absurdity of their line of reasoning, we go to the actuaries' tables¹ and take the number of children there shown at five years of age to be pupils in the first primary grade, and divide as before, we find that less than 9 per cent. of the pupils who ought to be in the first primary grade actually enter that grade. If we carry the same reasoning a step further, substituting in secondary schools the number of births in one year that produce the school population, as shown by the actuaries' tables, and divide this number by the school population, we show that less than 12 per cent. were ever born — *reductio ad absurdum*. The conclusion is that the method of reasoning heretofore followed, and producing these small percentages, is utterly unreliable. We must, therefore, look to some other method, if we hope to get an approximate notion of the actual efficiency of our high schools as a part of our public-school system. There can be little doubt that confusion has arisen from confounding high-school enrollment with high-school efficiency — two entirely different things.

But how may we get at this difference? Suppose we have given a course of study twelve years in length, four years in the high school, four in the grammar school, four in the primary school — one-third of the entire course in each. Given a number of pupils equal to 1,200, evenly distributed throughout the course of study, 100 in each year; then 400 would be in the high school, 400 in the grammar school, 400 in the primary school, or $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. of the total enrollment in each school;

¹ See *Report High School Department*, U. S. N. Y., 1898, p. 329.

i. e., this $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. of enrollment found in each school would be 100 per cent., of efficiency for that school, since it would be meeting the complete demand of the system upon it. Given that there are to be no additions to or subtractions from the number of pupils, excepting by graduation from the high school, then in the space of twelve years the entire 1,200 will have been graduated from the high school. It follows that the maximum possibility, 100 per cent., of high-school efficiency has been realized, while at no time has the enrollment of the high school exceeded $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. of the original number.

Apply the above line of reasoning to an actual case.¹ The actual enrollment in the public schools in one of the cities of the state of New York for the year 1900-1 was 2,180. The course of study is twelve years in length; four of these years are in the high-school course. If $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. of the enrollment had been in the high school, then 726 different pupils would have enjoyed high-school advantages during the year.

Of this number, 671, or 30.7 per cent. of the total public-school enrollment, were actually enrolled in the high school, *i. e.*, $\frac{671}{2180}$ of the maximum possibility was realized. This fraction reduced to a decimal gives 92.1—the efficiency of the high school in that city. This same result may be obtained by dividing 30.7, the actual percentage of total enrollment, by $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent., the maximum possible enrollment, or by multiplying the percentage of enrollment by three.

The number enrolled for the same year in the same city in the middle four years of the twelve, or in the grammar school, was 638, or 29.27 per cent. of the total enrollment. In the first four years, or in the primary school, it was 871, or 40 per cent. of the total enrollment. If 30.7 per cent. of the total enrollment in the high school means that only 31 in each 100 ever enjoy high-school advantages, then it must follow that 29 per cent. of enrollment in the grammar school means that only 29 in each 100 ever enjoy the advantages of the grammar school, and 40 per cent of enrollment in the primary school means that only 40 in each 100 ever enjoy the privileges of the primary

¹ See *Popular Educator*, April, 1897, p. 355.

school. It must follow, therefore, that only 40 in each 100 of the total school registration begin their school life in the primary schools. The question that naturally arises at this point is, *where do the other 60 in each 100 begin their school life?* A second time, by the very same methods in common use, we have reached a conclusion which is absurd. Since our entire public-school population practically begin school life in the primary schools, it is evident that there is a fault in the methods heretofore used in reaching percentages, and that there is a vast difference between high-school enrollment and the number of those actually enjoying the advantages of our high schools.

From the cases taken it would seem that the relation of high-school efficiency to high-school enrollment is as 3 to 1. Upon this hypothesis have been compiled the following tables for ten cities in New York state and ten in the state of Massachusetts, showing the percentage of high-school enrollment and high-school efficiency in each, as related to the total enrollment of all the public schools in the cities taken.

If this method of reasoning is corrected by the actuaries' tables, and an allowance made for those who fail of promotion for various causes, the conclusion that the figures usually given to represent the high school are just one-third of what they should be is conservative.

One thing is certain, that the agitation of the question of high-school attendance has drawn attention so pointedly to this matter that secondary-school men have been aroused to a greater effort to secure attendance upon high schools. This is shown by the returns of the various state superintendents as well as by reports of the United States Commissioner of Education. New York state, with her 741 high schools and academies, is a brilliant example of the case in point. In 1888¹ there were enrolled in the secondary schools of the state of New York 31,590 pupils. Ten years later the enrollment was 66,342 pupils—an increase in ten years upon attendance of 121 per cent. The number of pupils² attending the 741 high schools and academies in New

¹ See *Director's Report of High Schools for New York State*, 1898, p. 326.

² See *ibid.*, 1901, p. 212.

York state for the year ending July 1, 1901, was 83,796—an increase of 26.3 per cent. since 1898, and of 165.3 per cent. since 1888. In the eighteen years that elapsed between 1870–1888, there was an increase of 141 high schools in New York state, a gain of 227 per cent. In the ten years from 1888–98, there was an increase of 311 schools, or an additional gain of 153 per cent. nearly. Within the full period of twenty-eight years, the grand increase for the state of New York was the addition of 452 high schools and academies, or 729 per cent.

COMPARATIVE TABLE SHOWING HIGH SCHOOL AND PUBLIC SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.

TEN CITIES IN NEW YORK.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Name of city.	Population in 1900.	Total public school enrollment in 1900-1.	High school enrollment in 1900-1.	Per cent. of high school enrollment to total enrollment.	Per cent. of high school efficiency.	Number of teachers in high school, 1900-1.	Number of pupils per teacher in high school, 1900-1.
Albany.....	95,000	12,896	761	5.9	17.7	28	27.1
Binghamton.....	39,647	7,320	748	10.2	30.6	24	31.1
Buffalo.....	360,000	58,000	2,823	4.8	14.4	81	34.8
Elmira.....	35,672	5,587	685	12.2	36.6	16	42.8
Ithaca.....	13,500	2,180	671	30.7	92.1	18	37.3
Poughkeepsie.....	24,029	3,240	448	13.8	41.4	12	37.3
Rochester.....	135,500	20,356	962	4.7	14.1	39	24.6
Syracuse.....	108,374	21,090	1,613	7.6	22.8	42	38.4
Utica.....	56,383	9,037	500	5.5	16.5	16	31.2
Yonkers.....	51,000	7,653	493	6.4	19.2	16	30.8

TEN CITIES IN MASSACHUSETTS.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Name of city.	Population in 1900.	Total public school enrollment in 1900-1.	High school enrollment in 1900-1.	Per cent. of high school enrollment to total enrollment.	Per cent. of high school efficiency.	Number of teachers in high school, 1900-1.	Number of pupils per teacher in high school, 1900-1.
Boston.....	573,686	91,796	6,519	7.1	21.3	191	34.1
Cambridge.....	91,886	16,065	1,320	8.2	24.6	60	22.0
Fall River.....	104,863	16,244	660	4.1	12.3	23	28.7
Lawrence.....	62,559	7,524	581	7.7	23.1	21	27.7
Lowell.....	94,969	12,692	871	6.8	20.4	29	30.0
Lynn.....	68,513	10,150	794	7.8	23.4	29	27.4
New Bedford.....	62,442	8,793	410	4.6	13.8	16	25.6
Somerville.....	63,000	12,345	1,065	8.6	25.8	42	25.3
Springfield.....	62,300	11,574	781	6.7	20.1	32	24.4
Worcester.....	121,064	23,725	3,039	12.8	38.4	70	43.4

NOTES: Column 4 is obtained by dividing column 3 by column 2. Column 5 is found by multiplying column 4 by 3. Column 7 is found by dividing column 3 by column 6.

The high school has come to stay as a part of our public-school system, of which it is the fitting head. Its usefulness, its importance, and its possibilities are just beginning to be realized. Each year is certain to see better buildings with better equipment devoted to this branch of free public education; each year will witness more and better trained high-school teachers at higher salaries. The educational development of the nineteenth century was abreast of the development in science or in commerce. Mr. Wells¹ is wrong when he says that the nineteenth century, when it shall take its place upon the chronological charts of the future, will be symbolized by a locomotive upon a railway. If the nineteenth century stands for anything that will distinguish it and place it upon the honor roll of the centuries it is its unparalleled achievements in public education. Mr. Well's picture is not complete. In front of his engine must be placed a schoolhouse, surmounted by the American flag, surrounded by a group of high school boys and girls.

The American public high school responds to the pulse of the spirit of American progress. It is a thoroughly democratic institution, and is destined to become, in an ever-increasing sense, the people's university.

F. D. BOYNTON.

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Ithaca, N. Y.

¹ *North American Review*, June, 1901, p. 801.

THE RECENT HISTORY AND PRESENT STATUS OF THE ENGLISH CURRICULUM.

TO ONE who has read, even cursorily, the exhaustive amount of material which has been read before educational gatherings or has appeared in educational journals, on the subject of English in the secondary school, in the past four or five years, it becomes no easy task to find some new and untouched problem, or to attack the old problems from any fresh point of view. It is not my purpose, therefore, to discuss any particular phase of the teaching of English, nor to make any original contribution either to the matter or the method of the subject, but rather, from the history of the growth and development of the English curriculum during the past decade, to bring into clearer light both what we have done and what still remains to be done. If, out of an analysis of the conditions operating to enlarge and strengthen the work in English; and if, out of a review of the steps whereby that curriculum has emerged, so to speak, into self-consciousness; and if, further, out of an analysis of the deluge of material with which we have been well-nigh submerged, I shall bring to the light of day something *non solum ad intuendum*, as Cicero puts it, *verum etiam ad imitandum*, I shall have done all that is in my thought to do.

A retrospect of the course in English during the past ten or fifteen years reveals a progress that is as revolutionary as it is encouraging. 'Tis a far throw from the narrow, scanty, circumscribed character of the work in English as it existed ten years ago in our secondary schools, to the broad, rich, generous, and vitalizing curriculum which we see today. Its growth has been an essentially organic one and has followed with striking and scrupulous fidelity the general laws of organic development. From a state of almost pure potentiality, we have seen it emerge into a separate and distinctive entity, gradually but steadily dissociating itself from the other subjects, and slowly but irresistibly gaining recognition for itself and for its right to a place in the hierarchy of studies.

To the pessimist, perhaps, this view of the situation may seem unwarrantably optimistic, and he may be tempted to call attention to the fact that, out of all the discussion and experimentation of the past decade, there is comparatively little upon which we are yet agreed. The situation apparently, in many respects, is as chaotic as ever. As one reads article after article on this and that phase of the English work, it may seem that we are as far at sea as we ever were, and that there is nothing definite yet attained upon which there is anything like agreement among authorities. One favors the use of the books set for college entrance requirements, another would reject them *in parte* or *in toto*. One believes that these books should be read in one order, another in another; one claims they should all be read in the senior year, another that they should be scattered through the entire four years; one believes that grammar should be taught in the high schools, another thinks it has no right there and should be completed in the grades; one is an earnest advocate of the claims of rhetoric to a place in the curriculum; another is equally insistent that these claims are irrational and ridiculous; one believes in much composition, and another in little, and so on, *ad infinitum, ad nauseam*. And, looking at the number of vexatious problems that still call for settlement, there may be a slight temptation to discouragement, and some mild justification for at least a tinge of pessimism. And yet this is but the natural note of occasional despondency which inevitably attends all growth and progress, and cannot possibly be regarded as a permanent or final attitude.

Evidences of an undeniable growth in both the social and educational interest in the subject of English are so numerous and convincing as to give abundant warrant to that attitude of modest optimism which, while admitting defects, and acknowledging imperfection, yet has faith in the higher tendency of events and the ultimate triumph of the best.

In the first place, English has, practically, in that period, come to assume a distinctive and individual place in the program of studies, and is rated on the same footing as Latin, German, History, and Physics. This alone is a progressive step of the first

rank, and indicates a growth in the appreciation and recognition of our mother tongue which may well call for felicitation.

In the second place, as a corollary of its recognition as a study of distinct cultural and disciplinary value, has come a time-apportionment adjusted to its merits. Instead of one period or occasionally two periods per week, we are now seldom content with less than four, and the growing tendency is toward five. This is but the outward expression of our feeling that English has claims of its own to all the rights and emoluments granted to other studies whose traditional aristocracy has hitherto given them undisputed sway over our course of study. We have come to some genuine appreciation of our own literature and to some active conception of the vital importance of cultivating in our young people a love for the true, the beautiful, and the good, which in such glittering store await the diligent delver after hidden treasure in the mine of English literature. "The course of study in English," says the committee on college entrance requirements, "should include two elements, the study of English literature and the cultivation of the art of expression;" and, further, it says:

English offers all, or nearly all, the opportunities for mental training afforded by the study of any language, and introduces the pupil to the literature of his own tongue, which must always be the chief source of his own inspirations, ideals, and æsthetic enjoyment, and must also be the vehicle of his communication with his fellow-men.

Upon the importance, then, of cultivating in our pupils a love for the noblest and best in English literature, we have come to unanimous and hearty agreement in the past ten years. In saying this I do not mean that there did not exist a keen and lively appreciation of English literature in the minds of teachers and parents previous to that time. Abundant evidence would contradict any such view. I would say, however, that the obligation to place it systematically before our young people, to guide and direct their steps in the bewildering and tortuous paths of literature, to vitalize their whole character and life with its truths, its inspirations, its ideals, its beauties, was not consciously present; and only as they came to it through the guidance of

cultivated and intelligent parents, or through the accidental and incidental interest of some inspiring teacher, did they come to know the glories of that literature to which the words of the most eloquent of Roman orators may well be transferred: "It nourishes youth, delights old age, adds honor to prosperity, is a refuge and a solace in adversity, is a source of delight at home and abroad, is with us in the night watches, in our wanderings, and at our rustic seats."

And so, through the agitation and discussion of recent years, we have come to recognize our obligations in this matter, and, whatever differences of opinion may exist regarding the particular bits of literature that should be read, we are all agreed that, to the extent to which time allows, a few at least of those noble works of English literature which have shed immortal luster on the English race and have bathed us all in something of the reflected glory and brilliance of their radiance, enlightening our minds, subduing our hearts, vivifying our wills, should be brought under the careful and thoughtful study of our young people. Upon this, I may say confidently, we are all agreed, and no more important development has taken place in the past ten years in educational activity than this same sense of obligation and responsibility for the cultivation of right tastes, of inspiring ideals, of enriching sentiments in our young men and women. The effect of this upon the social fabric, while not perhaps appreciable in the immediate present, cannot be otherwise than stimulating and suggestive to the coming generation. The general average of literary standards and taste will be raised, and the time cannot be far distant when the results of this cumulative work on the part of the educational forces of the country must be felt from the most populous cities to the most isolated farms.

Another point in which great gain is noticeable is in the matter of composition. The time dates not so far back when one or two essays a term was deemed adequate, or if not adequate, it was at least all that was demanded. Gradually there came to consciousness the feeling that composition as a vital mode of social communication—one of the essential ways

by which we impart our thought to others and receive their thought to ourselves—must be taught more extensively, systematically, and continuously. As this thought became dynamic, more and more consideration, a larger measure of time, and wider and more scientific training in the art of expression became manifest. Composition—the art of expressing one's self accurately, forcefully, felicitously, with the design of influencing or delighting our fellow—came more and more to assume its rightful place and value, and we now concede to no exercise a higher importance, either from a disciplinary or utilitarian point of view. When we compare the meager attention given to composition in our school days with that which is now bestowed upon it, we come to some realization of the almost revolutionary character of the attitude—social and educational—toward composition.

Another evidence of the enhanced importance of English lies in the increased teaching force. Not so many years ago teachers whose time was entirely devoted to the work in English, save in the largest high schools, where there were so many pupils that even one or two recitations a week would consume the entire time of one teacher—save in such schools and under such circumstances, I say, special teachers in English were an unknown feature in secondary work. English teaching, such as it was, was done by anybody and everybody, anyhow and anyhow, in the interstices of other duties. Now how different! Teachers especially equipped and trained in English are as much in demand as are teachers trained in the classics and in science. Every secondary school worthy of the name has its one, two, three, or more, teachers whose whole time is devoted to instruction in English language and literature in some one or more of its phases; and, save in incidental ways like grammatical errors, oral discourse, or mistakes in spelling, capitalization, punctuation, etc., the other teachers are rightly not held to accountability for the work in English. This fact is another indication of the higher responsibility and obligation which we have come to feel toward instruction in English. Society is willing, nay anxious, to expend its money; and men and women

are willing to devote their life efforts and energies to improving the medium of communication and to enriching the intellectual treasures of the oncoming generation. That is a marvelous advance in thought from a generation ago and well deserves our thoughtful pride.

In the number, the character, and the content of our textbooks, we find still another evidence of the increased interest, the productive thought, and the improved tools whereby our English instruction is given. We may feel that we are well-nigh submerged with new texts, but the multiplicity of them is proof of a certain demand far in advance of other days, and the strenuous attempts at originality, whether in form or content, are equal proof that, like the Athenians of old, we are ever seeking after something new, and are so interested in the subject that we are devouring all sorts of patent nostrums for accomplishing the desired end.

And so, whether they are heavy or light, whether they are as bare of illustrations as a bodkin, or whether they are mere picture books; whether they advocate this mode of approach and this course of treatment, or whether, for novelty's sake, they advocate directly the opposite, at all events they are catering to a live and active interest and are appealing to a teaching constituency which is as thirsty for some new idea in methods of teaching as the Ancient Mariner was for water. And it is all the manifestation, whether viewed from the standing point of demand or supply, whether exercised rationally or irrationally, of that lively interest which will in time, through many an error and much of stumbling, work such desirable good to English and American life—active and passive.

And now as to the unsettled problems. We are agreed on the main lines of our English instruction—literature, composition, grammar, familiarity with at least the fundamental principles of rhetoric. It is on the details only, I think I may safely say, that we find differences of opinion, inevitable in the constructive process of any work, whether material or spiritual.

It is doubtful whether the English curriculum can ever become as fixed and determinate as the curriculum in Latin or mathe-

matics. There are inherent difficulties in the subject which make that improbable, if not impossible—and doubtless undesirable even if possible. We have been, however, working toward definiteness and some degree of unity, and, while the time will never come, I fancy, when the courses in different schools will agree, there will soon, if there has not already, come a time when we shall be in substantial agreement on the essential features of such a curriculum.

The unsolved problems are the problems which logically grow out of progress and it will be an unfortunate day when they shall all be solved. New problems in English, as in other parts of the program of studies, must arise with changing conditions in the social organism, and only as *it* ceases to grow will problems cease to arise. Shall we or shall we not accept and use the books recommended for college entrance requirements? That is a question which the test of experiment will settle for us within a few years. We have no need to hurry the process by *a priori* arguments pro or con, or by premature analogies with the feudal system or the human organism. If it is found not to adjust itself closely and logically to the needs of life and society, it will be banished to the limbo of discarded absurdities; but, if it does, it will live. As an effort after unity and definiteness, it is wholly to be commended; and attacking it on the ground of something imposed from without, as a phase of a sort of feudal conception of the relation of college to secondary school, as Professor Scott has done, is neither warranted by the motives which inspired it nor by the necessities which occasioned it. Whether the list of books selected is a permanent and final one, or whether it is but a step in the evolution of the English curriculum, is a question for the future historian of educational progress to determine; but at present the list is serving a most useful and commendable purpose in giving concreteness, definiteness, and unity to what was in danger of becoming a most chaotic and hopeless mess.

The evolution of the English curriculum, on its philosophic side, is but the outward manifestation of an inner striving after a closer and finer identification of the parts of the social organ-

ism with one another. In the unity of thought, feeling, and will created by the study of the masterpieces of the human mind, we find the ground for a higher social life. In the centering of interest on the art of expression, we find the search after a better understanding and a closer identification of ourselves with our fellow-men, wherein less of friction, of misunderstanding, of maladjustment, shall be found, because of the misuse and abuse of language.

And so today the teachers of English *par excellence* may feel that, in the process of social evolution and in the work which they do in elevating the tastes, stimulating the ideals, ennobling the feelings of the younger generation through English literature, and likewise in binding society more closely and more intelligently together by a more exact and scientific use of the art of expression—oral and written—they are playing a part second to none, whether considered from the view-point of society as a whole, or from that of the individual.

JAMES H. HARRIS.

MICHIGAN MILITARY ACADEMY,
Orchard Lake, Michigan.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

GEORGE HERBERT LOCKE.

THE moral and the physical aspects of high-school education make us much trouble and anxiety. We admit their importance, but, aside from a few platitudes at conventions, we make but little progress toward any practical solutions. There are but few playing fields in connection with any of our schools, and hence the work in physical and moral training is pursued where the influence of the school is but little felt. That the playing field is as much an integral part of the school as is the school building seems not to be in the minds of those who are responsible for the education of adolescent girls and boys. The remedy for this does not lie in a gymnasium. We must not allow the gymnasium to be used as a substitute for the playing field, but as a complement to it. There are many teachers who are wrestling with this subject, and we invite them to communicate the results of their experience so that this important part of high-school training may receive the attention that it deserves. The most interesting question is: "What are you doing in your school toward the solution of this problem of physical and moral education?"

That we may have an historical background the following interesting and scholarly article on "Athleticism in Greece," by Mr. E. Norman Gardiner, is reprinted from the *Journal of Education* of London, Eng.:

At the entrance of the Stadium at Olympia, the last sight that competitors would see before they entered the course, stood sixteen brazen statues of Zeus. They were called the Zanes, and were erected out of the fines imposed upon athletes who had behaved shamefully at the games. The first six were put up, in the ninety-eighth Olympiad, in consequence of a certain Eupolus having bribed his rivals to let him win in the boxing. The inscriptions on the bases, which alone survive, recorded that not with money, but with swiftness of foot and bodily vigor, must one win prizes at Olympia. Fifty-six years later six more statues were set up to commemorate a similar offense committed by the Athenian Callippus in the Pentathlon. On this occasion the Athenians haughtily refused to pay or to take any part in the Olympic festival, but the god at Delphi, indignant at such impiety, declined to give them any oracle till the fine was paid. This oracle was inscribed on the base of one of the statues, together with some lines warning all competitors against such conduct. The remaining four statues recorded similar offenses on the part of certain wrestlers.

These statues are full of instruction. In the first place they give us some idea of the high standard of honor in Greek athletics. If we think of the thousands who must have competed in these games during the twelve hundred years that they were held, the fewness of the offenses is truly remarkable. The greatest precautions were taken to safeguard the honor of the games; the competitors had undergone a month's training under the eyes of the magistrates of Elis; they had sworn a solemn oath on

the altar of Zeus that they would compete fairly and abide by the rules of the games; and any transgression was therefore an act of sacrilege, an insult to the gods, and was punished as such.

But these statues are still more interesting from another point of view. Much indignation has been recently aroused by certain lines of Mr. Kipling's about "muddied oafs" and "flanneled fools." The very violence of the criticism upon them, most of them utterly beside the point, shows that Mr. Kipling has touched a sore place. No intelligent person can imagine for a moment that Mr. Kipling intended to attack games or athletics in themselves. What he attacked was the over-athleticism which we see rampant around us, whether in the form of the professional pure and simple, who makes his living by affording a spectacle to loafers, or of the still worse professional amateur, who, having no need to work for his living, neglects his profession, if he has any, and devotes the best years of his life to purely selfish enjoyment. Such a life can no more make a man a useful citizen than reading newspaper reports or watching matches can make him a sportsman. It is a far cry from Mr. Kipling to Euripides; but, had Mr. Kipling lived in Athens at the close of the fifth century, he would have found similar cause for his indignation. The language of Euripides, if perhaps more refined, is no less scathing: "Of all the myriad evils throughout Greece there is none worse than the race of athletes; they never learn how to live well, nor can they endure poverty or evil fortune. Honored in their youth they stalk about as public ornaments, but when old age comes upon them they are thrown aside like old coats that have lost their nap." Perhaps Euripides was prejudiced — his parents had tried to make him an athlete against his will — but the verdict of Plato, an enthusiast for physical training, and himself a competitor at the games, of Socrates, Aristotle, and many others, is the same. Now it is to this period that the first Zanes belong. Never had athletics been more popular; but this popularity had brought its own dangers, and beneath its glamour the poet, the philosopher, the statesman could see the evils which were to sap the life of Greek athletics and render them an object of contempt to the more practical Romans. Let me try and describe briefly the character of the early Greek games and the causes that led to their decay.

Greek sports, as we read of them in Homer, and as they doubtless continued in the early days of Olympia, were merely an expression of intense national energy, the joy in all activity, physical or intellectual, by virtue of which all that is young and vigorous, whether nation or individual, loves to match itself against others in all contests of mind or body. This spirit of emulation and consequent love of adventure characterized the Greeks of old no less than the English of the Elizabethan age; in colonial activity and love of sport we are the heirs of Greece. So, as in the days of the tournament or the archery meeting, every important occasion would be celebrated by sports. No training was needed; war and the chase kept all the Homeric warriors in training, and the events in the games were all connected with these pursuits. But as life became more settled and more civilized, and men began to congregate in towns, war and the chase were no longer the conditions of everyday life, and it became necessary to supplement them by a system of physical training. The object of this was principally to make every man fit to defend his country. But the Greek was always an artist and an idealist, and he introduced into his physical training the ideal of physical beauty, of harmony and symmetry. Every Greek had from boyhood to undergo such a training, not in one, but in many forms of exercise, the object being not to produce special development or to break records, but to make him a useful

citizen, healthy and beautiful. This was the ideal of the golden age of Greek games, the beginning of the fifth century. It is the Graces, according to Pindar, that give victory in the games, "by whose gift come unto men all pleasant things and sweet, and the wisdom of a man and his beauty, and the splendor of his fame;"¹ and Pindar never tires of singing of the beauty of the victor, "deft-handed, nimble-limbed, with the light of valor in his eyes." It was this ideal that made the Greek gymnasium and palestra the school of the finest sculpture the world has ever seen.

Hence, too, came the glory of the great Greek games; they were under the special protection of the gods, and poets sang how gods and heroes had founded them, and themselves had won the victors' crown. The victors themselves received honors almost divine; for they represented the embodiment of the nation's ideal. Sculptors and poets immortalized their beauty and their prowess for the imitation of posterity.

But toward the close of the fifth century there came a change in the attitude of poets and philosophers toward athletics. "Can a man fight against the enemies of his country with a discus in his hand?" asks Euripides. Even the beauty of the athlete is no more. "The runner," says Socrates, "has big legs and narrow shoulders, the boxer big shoulders and thin legs." Later on Epaminondas complains that athletics do not train a soldier. What is the reason for this change? It is the decline in the character of the games themselves; and this decline is due to two causes which are very much in evidence in our own times—money and professionalism.

In the earlier days rich and poor met on an equal footing in the gymnasium and at the games. Nobles and princes, even kings, competed in contests of strength or speed of foot, and rich and poor were honored alike in their victory. If Pindar sings of the triumphs of the wealthy Diagoridæ, Simonides does not disdain to commemorate the victory of the poor fisherman "who once upon his shoulders carried fish from Argos to Tegea." But as the games, and especially the Olympic games, grew from local festivals into national, and princes and nobles flocked to them in ever greater numbers from the rich colonies of the East and the West, a different spirit grew up. These powerful princes and nobles from over the sea disdained the simpler contests of physical power, in comparison with the chariot races and horse races, where they might display their might and magnificence. A king of Macedon had once thought it an honor to be allowed to compete in the foot race; but this was no longer the spirit of the nobility, which was rather that of Alcibiades, who boasted that he had enhanced the glory of Athens by sending seven chariots to compete at Olympia, and winning three out of the first four places. The character of the chariot race itself had changed. In Homer the heroes drove their own chariots, and by their own judgment, skill, and nerve helped to win the victory. At Olympia it was no longer the owner, but the paid charioteer, who drove; the owner paid and took the crown and glory, but it was the horses, the trainers, and the drivers that won the race. Plutarch tells us a delightful story of the Spartan king Agesilaus, whose sister Cynisca won the chariot race at Olympia. Finding that the Spartans were growing too fond of horses and of chariots, he himself persuaded his sister to enter for the chariot race. "This he did to show the Greeks that a victory of that kind did not depend on any extraordinary spirit or ability, but rather upon riches and expense." What a comment on much of our modern horse racing and yachting!

But, if the simpler sports ceased to be fashionable, they were as popular as ever, and the rewards for the victors, if less in point of honor, offered still greater attractions

¹ *Odes of Pindar*. E. Myers.

from a pecuniary point of view. In early days the Greeks were a nation of athletes; jumping, running, throwing the disc or the javelin, wrestling, and boxing were a part of their everyday life, and no special training was needed; a simple training diet of figs, cheese, and bread was prescribed, possibly with a view of putting all, rich and poor, on an equality. Unfortunately, as the competition increased, it was discovered that special excellence in special events could be produced by special training; the runner or jumper might need activity, but the boxer and wrestler needed weight. So one Dromeus in the fifth century introduced a diet of meat. The strong man trained on quantities of meat naturally became heavy and coarse; his beauty was gone. We can trace the gradual change in sculpture and in painting from the graceful figures of the sixth and fifth centuries to the brutal repulsiveness of the Roman boxers in the baths of Caracalla, with their clumsy, over-developed bodies and small, narrow heads. A Panathenaic vase in the British Museum, dated 336 B. C., is an interesting example of the transition. The work of Dromeus was completed by one Stymphalus of Selymbria, a contemporary of Socrates, "who ruined athletics by introducing elaborate rules for eating, drinking, and exercise."¹ This was the real beginning of specialization and of professionalism, the curses of true athletics; specialization produces one-sided development; professionalism converts what should be a means of education and of recreation into an end in itself. Instead of fostering the spirit of sport, and furthering the physical education of a nation, such athletics tend to produce a class of professional athletes and a nation of spectators. This is the athleticism that Euripides satirized in Athens, as Mr. Kipling has done in England.

And with professionalism came other evils: the high spirit of honor was lost, and corruption began to appear. The Olympic games had existed for nearly four hundred years before Eupolus was fined for buying his victory in boxing. It is most curious to note how history repeats itself. The two forms of sport which were the first to be corrupted by professionalism in Greece were, as in England, boxing and wrestling. The healthiest and noblest of all sports while practiced in the spirit of amateurism, by reason of the high code of honor which they demand, they are the most readily degraded when practiced as a means of living. For years they were utterly discredited in England in consequence, and only of recent years have they begun to revive.

With professionalism, too, partly as cause, partly as effect, came a great increase in the number of athletic meetings and the value of the prizes. At Olympia the prize was never more than a crown of olive; but even there the victor reaped substantial rewards on his return home, and elsewhere the prizes were often extremely valuable, and sometimes in Ionia took the form of money. Pausanias tells us of an Alexandrian boxer who was fined for being late at Olympia; he excused himself on the ground that his ship had been detained by contrary winds. It was proved, however, by witnesses that he had really been collecting money at the games in Ionia. This was in the late days of Olympia; but pot-hunting must have been common long before this time; for the great boxer and pankratiast Theagenes is said to have won no less than fourteen hundred crowns.

Such is briefly the history of athleticism in Greece. I have tried to point out some of the parallels which it affords with the present state of athletics in England. No nation ever had a higher ideal of athletics than the Greeks; nowhere did athletics hold a higher place, connected as they were with the whole life of the nation—reli-

¹ PROFESSOR GARDNER, *New Chapters from Greek History*.

gion, politics, education, art—and serving not only to develop the individual, but as a bond of union between the scattered members of the Greek race throughout the whole world. But Greek athletics failed to save the nation; they failed from neglect of that principle of proportion and harmony that distinguishes all that is best in Greek literature and art; over-developed and over-specialized they became the monopoly of a class, and ceased to affect the life of the nation. The older sports, in which all competed in friendly and honorable rivalry, gave way to professional displays where an unathletic crowd could enjoy the excitement of the contest by proxy. Love of excitement took the place of love of sport, and the last stage was reached in the brutal exhibition of the Roman gladiatorial shows. What athletics did for the Greeks of the fifth century, what they have done for our own race, it is hard to over-estimate. But let us take to heart before it is too late the lessons of Greek history by keeping athletics in their true place, as a means, not as an end; let us play in order that we may live, not live in order that we may play; and let us remember, too, that it is better to play oneself than to watch others playing.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Teaching of History and Civics in the Elementary and the Secondary School. By HENRY E. BOURNE, Professor in the College for Women, Western Reserve University, pp. 385. Longmans, Green & Co., 1902. \$1.50.

THIS important work is the second volume of the *American Teachers' Series*. In conception and execution it is, in the main, altogether admirable; although, as will be indicated later, its conservatism at times appears excessive. But it is simply amazing what the author has put into 385 pages, and that without making it obscure or hard reading. In fact the style is attractive and the matter of space so carefully handled that little obvious crowding is apparent. No teacher of history who aspires to be more than a routine drudge should fail to read it carefully from cover to cover. It contains not only stimulating discussions of historical problems, as they appear in the schools, but also well-selected bibliographies and topical analyses. These should render it an indispensable daily aid in "getting up" the work, which conscientious teachers usually do, as they should, no matter what their preparation may be or how often they have been over the subject.

The first part opens with a discussion of the meaning of history, showing the development of the conception from early times to the present. Following this is a chapter on the foundations of historical scholarship, that is, the conditions and resources necessary for the development of historical investigation. The great national collections of resources are here briefly described, with some account of the sifting process or criticism of these sources. The subjects, aims, and methods of historical instruction in France and Germany are next considered; and then, in the light of these facts, conditions in America are passed in review, special attention being given to the recommendations of the several bodies which have taken up the subject, from the Madison Conference to the Committee of Seven. The decision of the last-named committee in favor of medieval and modern history for the second year, rather than French or English history, "so taught as to elucidate the general movement of history," is adopted with slight modifications. This will undoubtedly win approval from the large body of practical teachers, who know from experience that what is done incidentally is done accidentally, and who hold that the general movement of history is not a fit subject for such treatment.

The fifth and sixth chapters, on the value of history, and the aim in teaching civics, are perhaps a trifle too subtle in parts, but they will repay careful reading. The reviewer does not remember to have seen a finer answer to the question, "What is my country?" These chapters bear with equal force on work below the high school.

The seventh chapter contains the author's assignment of work for grades five to twelve inclusive. He would introduce certain parts of European history below the high school, as is done abroad. For the high school he accepts the plan of the Committee of Seven for the first and fourth years. But he would devote the second year

to the period from 395 to 1560, not, however, including the voyages of discovery, and the third year to the history of European expansion in the New World down to 1783. These suggestions should at least provoke fruitful discussion.

Chapters eight to eleven inclusive deal with the problem of methods. First comes a useful list of bibliographical aids and guides; next, a discussion of what facts should be emphasized; third, the general method of teaching; and, lastly, a special chapter on the source method. This is approved only as a means of illustration, not as an exclusive method of instruction.

In this connection it is worthy of note that while he still vigorously attacks the abuse of the text-book, the memoriter method, and the assignment of history to teachers without special preparation, the larger schools are frequently struggling with exactly the opposite difficulty. Their problem is how to protect the children from the specialist in history, fresh from college, who overwhelms them with outlines and note-books and references and special topics and inductions and deductions, until their heads swim, and the hours of the day and the night are all too short to do the mere mechanical writing required.

Part II, occupying the last half of the book, may be regarded as an expansion of chapter nine in "the facts of most worth." The chapters take up in succession Ancient, Greek, Roman, and Medieval History; The Expansion of Europe; European History Since 1560; History of the United States; Course of Study in the Elementary School; and the Teaching of Civics. In each chapter the setting of the age and country is first succinctly given, and the general movements of history sketched; then follows a condensed list of topics suitable for treatment in class.

In these parts of the work there comes to light a curious fact—the almost total neglect of the economic element in history, coupled with an old-fashioned insistence on military and political details. No teacher could cover half the topics of this nature laid down in the list without getting the class hopelessly swamped. That this is not an accident, but a result of the author's conception of history, will appear from the following quotations:

Akin to the development of institutions is the transformation of industrial life. . . . Some would even go so far as to make industrial development the theme about which historical details should be organized. . . . The question at once presses for answer, Can as much human interest be put into such historical treatment as is characteristic of the older method. . . . Nevertheless, it is desirable that some attempt should be made to reorganize historical facts in accordance with this aspect of events, although it is possible that a less industrial age may regard with disdain the supreme importance which this generation attaches to economic facts. . . .

Now, without advocating any doctrine of historical materialism, the reviewer submits that this is an entirely inadequate and even contemptuous treatment of one of the most important factors in history, especially since the lists of topics give no evidence of the reorganization admitted to be desirable. Is it any wonder that schools are known as the last refuge of exploded theories? or that discoveries in science are said to require twenty years to get into the text-books?

A single example of the waste of time and energy caused by this singular omission must suffice. The author devotes much attention to feudalism, making it one of the chief topics in the Middle Ages; but, without explaining what caused it. No pupil will rest content with that, even if the teacher is satisfied; it is a bridge with one end hanging in midair. Of course, the cause was the prevalence of a natural economy, which is not a difficult concept to explain, provided concrete examples be

employed. Is it better to do this, or to let the teachers and pupils continue to grope in darkness? The reviewer knows whereof he speaks; for he was brought up on precisely such books and methods, and never ceased wondering why all the medieval kings were smitten with the same madness for squandering their lands and powers on treacherous nobles, till he got into Lamprecht's Seminar. Must we continue to go to Germany for such simple facts of history?

This defect excepted, which some would doubtless not consider a defect, the book is worthy of all praise.

EDWARD VAN DYKE ROBINSON.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL,
St. Paul, Minn.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

[The notice here given does not preclude the publishing of a comprehensive review of any of these books.]

The Boy Problem—A Study in Social Pedagogy. By William Byron Forbush. Introduction by G. Stanley Hall. Size 5×7. Pp. 206. Price —. Boston: The Pilgrim Press.

This is an interesting contribution to a very important aspect of education and will be reviewed at length in a subsequent issue. An excellent bibliography is appended.

Advanced French Prose Composition. By Victor E. François, University of Michigan. Size 5×7. Pp. 292. Price 80 cents. New York: American Book Co.

This book is intended to be used two hours a week in the work of the second year in colleges and of the third and fourth years in high schools. It is the continuation of the *Introductory French Prose Composition*. The exercises are of continued prose, of interesting content, and the illustrations are certainly a refreshing innovation in a work on prose composition.

Mon Oncle et Mon Curé. Par Jean de la Brete. Edited for school use by Elizabeth M. White. Size 5×7. Pp. 222. Price 50 cents. New York: American Book Co.

This charming story has been somewhat abridged and adapted for school purposes, but in the revising process the story has not been injured. The annotations are judicious, and some exercises in composition based on the reading matter are added.

Les Malheurs de Sophie. By Madame la Comtesse de Ségur. Edited by Elizabeth M. White. Size 5×7. Pp. 76. Price 45 cents. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

This is for young children and may very well be used in the grammar grades where French has been introduced.

Vingt Mille Lieues sous les Mers. By Jules Verne. Edited by C. Fontaine. Size 4½×6½. Pp. 201. Price 40 cents. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

This standard book for boys ought to engage interest in our high-school classes in French.

A First Scientific French Reader. By B. L. Bowen, Ohio State University.
Size 5×7. Pp. 288. Price 90 cents. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

This reader is intended for use in the technical schools and in the scientific courses in our universities. We have long felt the want of some such work, as doubtless we shall again when our commercial courses are established. The ordinary literary language will not avail for these technical pursuits.

Das Edle Blut, von Ernst von Wildenbruch. Edited by Charles A. Eggert.
Size 5×7. Pp. 86. Price 30 cents. New York: American Book Co.

German Composition, with notes and vocabulary. By E. C. Wesselhoeft, University of Pennsylvania. Size 5×7. Pp. 77. Price—, Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

A Spanish Grammar, with exercises. By M. Montrose Ramsey, Leland Stanford Junior University. Size 5×7½. Pp. 610. Price—, New York: Henry Holt & Co.

A comprehensive review will appear shortly.

Writing Latin. By John Edmund Barss. Size 5×7. Pp. 77. Price 50 cents. New York: University Publishing Co.

The author has combined many good features in very small space. He has abundance of easy sentences, he uses words that appear in Cæsar's *Gallic War* and he preserves the balance between the sentence given for the sake of illustrating an idiom and the sentence as a part of a bit of continuous prose. The explanations, while terse, are clear, and in the hands of a good teacher this ought to prove a very useful book in the work of the second year.

Select Orations and Letters of Cicero. Revised by J. B. Greenough and G. L. Kittredge, with a special vocabulary by J. B. Greenough. Size 5×7. Pp. 226. Price \$1.45. Boston: Ginn & Co.

This volume is intended to meet the needs of those teachers who prefer marked quantities and who wish to introduce their students to Cicero's *Letters*. A review will appear shortly.

A Latin Grammar for Schools. By Andrew Fleming West. Size 5×7½. Pp. 262. Price 90 cents. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Mr. West says that this book is planned to give as much grammar as is serviceable in the school study of Latin. In this his ideal differs from that of many other authors of Latin grammars, and yet his defense is well made. We hope to publish an expert opinion on this important book.

The Teaching of History and Civics in the Elementary and the Secondary School. By Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University. Size 5×7½. Pp. 385. Price \$1.50. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.
Reserved for review.

First Steps in the History of England. By Arthur May Mowry. Size 5½×7½. Pp. 324. Price 70 cents. New York: Silver, Burdett & Co.

This is a well printed, well illustrated, and interesting story of the men who have made England. The gorgeous binding might prejudice a person of quiet taste.

Our Country's Story. By Eva March Tappan. Size $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$. Pp. 267. Price 65 cents. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

This is an elementary history of the United States, well illustrated and written in a very interesting manner, though at times there are expressions that seem to indicate that to interest children one must descend. It is more than doubtful if children appreciate such condescension in language. The account of the land campaign of 1812-13 receives the customary *line* and the naval campaign the usual pages.

Training for Citizenship. By Joseph Warren Smith. Size $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$. Pp. 345. Price 90 cents, net. Boston: Lothrop Publishing Co.

This is a wonderfully comprehensive work and will be reviewed at greater length. It is divided into five parts treating respectively of the home and the school government, the township and its government, the village and county government, the state government, and the national government. This book will fill a place in our high schools and will strengthen specially the commercial course.

The Government—What it Is—What it Does. By Salter Storrs Clark. Size 5×7 . Pp. 304. Price —. New York: American Book Co.

The meaning of government, its principal functions, self-government in the United States, officials and their duties, certain practical operations of government, a little law, list of the chief governments of the world, indicate the nature of this book.

Graded Work in Arithmetic. By S. W. Baird. Size 5×7 . Pp. 159. Price 25 cents. New York: American Book Co.

The book begins with a review of the essential parts of the arithmetic taught in the previous years, and in the latter part acts as an introduction to algebra and mensuration.

Atwood's Complete Graded Arithmetic. By George E. Atwood. Grades III to VI, inclusive, now ready. Size 5×7 . Pp. 160. Price 25 cents per grade. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

Academic Algebra. By Wooster Woodruff Beman, University of Michigan, and David Eugene Smith, Columbia University. Size 5×7 . Pp. 383. Price \$1.25. Boston: Ginn & Co.

This work is intended to cover the subject of elementary algebra with sufficient thoroughness to prepare the student for college. The problems are very numerous and well graded. There is a minimum of theory and a maximum of practical work with problems.

Observations and Exercises on the Weather. By James A. Price, Fort Wayne High School. Size 8×10 . Pp. 59. Price 30 cents. New York: American Book Co.

This is a useful supplement to the work in physical geography in our high schools. With this aid the observations, now too often taken at random, may be systematized and preserved.

Elementary Physiology and Hygiene. By Buel P. Colton, Illinois State Normal University. Size 5×7 . Pp. 317. Price 60 cents. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

This is a condensation of the author's larger work, and is intended especially for

pupils in the grammar grades. The latter part contains many excellent suggestions in regard to treatment of persons who have been injured, the simple remedies to be applied, etc. It is a useful book in the schoolroom.

Elements of Physics, experimental and descriptive. By Amos T. Fisher, assisted by Melvin J. Patterson. Size 5×7. Pp. 184. Price 60 cents. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

This book is intended for young pupils, so the authors state, but the method of presentation seems not to be such as might enlist the interest of the natural boy. There is a very distinct resemblance to the books on physics which make no such announcement. The questions that are appended to each chapter seem to indicate that the teacher needs to be told what questions are to be asked so that the subject may be adequately covered.

Tarr and McMurry Geographies, supplementary volume, Ohio. By Stella S. Wilson, Central High School, Columbus, Ohio. Size 6×7. Pp. 100. Price 30 cents. New York: The Macmillan Co.

While this supplement is presumably for special circulation in Ohio, it will be useful as supplementary reading in other states because of the interesting details it contains. The work has been well done.

Essentials of Chemistry for Secondary Schools. By John C. Hessler and Albert L. Smith. Size 5½×7½. Pp. 540. Price \$1.20. Boston: Benj. H. Sanborn & Co.

The authors claim that this book has been written to meet the demand for a textbook of chemistry that shall contain "an adequate and scientific account of such of the fundamental facts, laws, and theories of the subject as are adapted to the needs of secondary schools and also *specific directions* for the laboratory work—directions that have been *tested* and found *practicable*." We hope to present a review of this book at another time.

Life and Health. By Albert F. Blaisdell. Size 5×7. Pp. 346. Price \$1.00. Boston: Ginn & Co.

This book is intended to serve as a textbook on physiology for high schools, academies, and normal schools. Hygiene is given a prominent place, first aid to the injured has an especially good chapter in that the directions to be followed in certain cases of fracture, etc., are illustrated, and the state requirements in regard to "alcoholic physiology" are complied with.

Elementary Physical Geography. By William Morris Davis, Harvard University. Size 5×7½. Pp. 401. Price \$1.40. Boston: Ginn & Co.

This is published no doubt in answer to the demand for some book a little simpler than the *Physical Geography* of the author. Mr. Davis's work was so far in advance of the ordinary teacher, who was just beginning to grow into this subject, that much of the good was wasted. How successful this new effort is we shall hope to determine by a review.

Animals at Home. By Lillian L. Bartlett. Size 5×7. Pp. 172. Price 45 cents. New York: American Book Co.

A useful supplementary book for the lower grades.

s
e

,
,

f
.
a
t
7

a
.

t
e